

Announcing the
TENTH ANNUAL CONVENTION
OF THE
League of Evangelical Students
FEBRUARY 21st through 24th—Philadelphia, Pa.
STUDENTS EVERYWHERE INVITED

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21ST

- 2:00 P. M. Registration of Delegates.
3:00 P. M. Address of Welcome—GORDON H. CLARK, Ph.D.,—University of Pennsylvania.
3:15 P. M. Devotional Address—ROBERT K. RUDOLPH, B.D.—Reformed Episcopal Seminary.
7:30 P. M. Address—WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, Th.D., D.D.—Columbia Theological Seminary.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22ND

- 8:30 A. M. Devotionals—DR. HAROLD PAUL SLOAN—Haddonfield Methodist Church.
9:00 A. M. Address—PROFESSOR ANDREW K. RULE—Louisville Presbyterian Seminary.
2:00 P. M. Address—JOHN MURRAY, M.A., Th.M.—Westminster Theological Seminary.
8:00 P. M. Address—CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D.—Calvin Theological Seminary.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23RD

- 9:00 A. M. Address—WILLIAM ADAMS, Th.D.—Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary.
2:00 P. M. Address—MISS JOHANNA TIMMER—Dean of Women, Calvin College.
2:40 P. M. Address—PROFESSOR JOHN ORR—Westminster College.
6:00 P. M. Banquet—Recitations by DR. J. GRESHAM MACHEN.
Messages from former Presidents of League.
Message from REV. H. McALLISTER GRIFFITHS—
“Christianity Today.”
8:30 P. M. PROFESSOR R. B. KUIPER—Westminster Theological Seminary.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 24TH

- 2:30 P. M. Preliminary Message—MRS. W. T. ELMORE—Returned Missionary, Eastern Baptist Seminary.
3:00 P. M. Address—REV. CHARLES J. WOODBRIDGE—Independent Board for Presbyterian Foreign Missions.
8:00 P. M. Sermon—J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.—Westminster Theological Seminary.

SPECIAL MUSIC PROMINENT LEADERS IN DEVOTIONALS

Convention Headquarters will be at the TENTH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, 17th and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lodging and breakfast will be provided free to all delegates whether League members or not. Send all registrations and reservations for rooms to Robert Murphy, Eastern Baptist Seminary, Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa., at least ten days before the time of the Convention.

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

CALVIN KNOX CUMMINGS, *Editor*

Vols. IX and X Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, January, 1935 No. 1

EDITORIAL

THE NEWLY APPOINTED EDITOR AND FIELD SECRETARY— AN INTRODUCTION

The time has come for the writer to relinquish his official connection with the League and commend to its constituency the incumbent, Mr. Calvin Knox Cummings who will act as Field Secretary of the movement. In urging his hearty support by the people of God we believe that few know as well as he the vicissitudes and difficulties of the League and its present challenging opportunities, and no one will be so faithful in maintaining the League true to the original purposes. Both as an undergraduate and graduate member of the League, and also as an officer of it, Mr. Cummings has been unostentatiously contending for the unequivocal genius of the League—a warm, intelligent, aggressive testimony for Christ among students. His witness for Christ in a college which is hostile to the evangelical Faith was noble, to say the least. The splendid equipment given him by a thorough theological seminary training particularly fits him for the task of meeting the spiritual problems of college and seminary students.

Many of the methods of League technique may change, and perhaps ought to change, but there must be no alteration of approach which fails to recognize that American students need a forceful, dynamic witness to the evangel, one which will perforce satisfy the longings of their minds as well as of their hearts.

Who can deny the need for the League in view of what the writer heard recently at an evangelistic session of a denominational gathering where pastors were urged to be evangelistic no matter what their theology, for they surely could unite on evangelism! Such a false irenic spirit is disastrous to the church at large, as well as to students. Who would declare the peculiar League approach as outmoded when one still finds theological professors who enjoin ministers to use the Bible for study, devotional comfort, teaching, worshiping, and sermonizing, for “whatever our theory of approach may be, it is a treasure-house of spiritual wisdom undying and imperishable”! Or again, to use the Bible in teaching because “it doesn’t make any difference what your belief”!

One of the leaders of a denominational student movement once wrote the present author that the League of Evangelical Students had been of great help in lifting up a banner against the doctrinal defection of the great Christian associations of this country. His was but one of the testimonies that used to reach the League office from time to time. The League is truly a touchstone for student movements, still it is not the Church, but a vital part of it, and as such a training ground for the future leaders of it. We earnestly and thoroughly believe that in the success of the League and her stirring evangelistic and apologetic message lies the success of a great portion of the Church. Our most earnest wishes go with Mr. Cummings in the field work in the hope that a period of vigorous leadership awaits him.

WILLIAM J. JONES

FOR WHAT ARE WE CONTENDING?

There is within the visible Christian Church today a mighty conflict between two mutually exclusive concepts of the nature of the Christian religion. The one—the evangelical—conceives of the Christian religion as *supernatural* (above the laws of nature) in its origin and operations. The other conceives of the Christian religion as purely *natural* (explicable according to the laws of nature) in its origin and operations. It is for the *supernatural* view of Christianity that the League of Evangelical Students has unequivocally taken its stand.

It is persistently urged by those who oppose the testimony of the League of Evangelical Students that in contending for this supernaturalism we are contending not for Christianity but for *our own particular interpretation* of the facts of Christianity. The Christian Church, it is asserted, has throughout the centuries had many different interpretations of the historic facts of Christianity. Origen in the third century held to the ransom theory of the atonement. Anselm of the eleventh century devised the satisfaction theory of the atonement. Archaic American Fundamentalism conceived of the substitutionary theory of the atonement. The modern religious thinker simply adheres to another theory of the atonement—the moral influence theory. Thus it is assumed that the modernist together with the evangelical accepts all the *facts* of Christianity. Thus it is charged that the *supernatural interpretation* is *human* in origin—the implication of course being that it is also an *erroneous* human interpretation.

Certainly if this contention is true then the League of Evangelical Students has not only had the wind taken out of its sails, but—to use a humble figure—it has had the bottom blown out of its boat. Then we are contending for one human authority against another human authority and not for that which is substantiated by the authority of God. The whole modern conflict is then simply the pitting of one man's word against that of another. But is the League of Evangelical Students contending for a humanly devised interpretation—and that an outmoded one?

In reply there are three facts to be observed.

First, the modernist has uncritically assumed that he accepts all the *facts* of Christianity which the evangelical accepts. It is right at this point of the *facts* of Christianity that the evangelical and the modernist part—and not on the question of the interpretation of these facts. To illustrate—a college professor recently remarked that he believed in the resurrection of Jesus but not in the bodily resurrection of Jesus. Now the resurrection of Jesus is a question of history. It is a question of fact. Either Christ arose bodily, or He did not. Gospel History and Apostolic History say He did. The Modernist says He did not. What the Modernist has done is to presuppose not only that the *supernatural doctrines* of Scripture are not true, but that the *supernatural facts* as well are not true. It could be demonstrated how this principle is consistently applied by the modernist to every supernatural fact in Scripture. The evangelical alone contends for the *facts* of Christianity as recorded in sacred history. He does not presuppose that because facts are supernatural therefore they are not true. He is governed by the evidence. And when he notes that there is more evidence for the bodily resurrection of Jesus than there is for the sermon on the mount he sees no reason why he should cleave to the latter and not to the former.

Second, the supernatural interpretation of the facts of Christianity is not *our* interpretation. It is Scripture's interpretation. It is God's interpretation. It is the only historic interpretation. Christianity de-supernaturalized is Christianity

extinct. It has originated not in the mind of man but in the mind of God. Through the aid of the Holy Spirit we have been thinking God's thoughts after Him. We simply receive what God has already revealed. Examples abound to substantiate this principle. Several will suffice. Christ came—that is the historic fact. Christ said "I am come to seek and to save that which was lost . . . to give my life a ransom for many"—that is the Christine, the Divine interpretation of that fact. Christ died—that is the historic fact. "Christ died for our sins," ". . . this is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many for the remissions of sins"—this is the historic God-given interpretation of the fact. It is the simple doctrine of the substitutionary atonement. Christ arose—a Gibraltar fact. Christ arose "for our justification"—that is the interpretation of one of the Apostles endowed with the prerogative of Divine authority and narrated in an epistle accepted by the severest of critics as authentic. Humbly do we receive and praise God for His transcendent interpretations. To reject them is to reject not the shifting opinions of men; it is to reject the infallible Word of the Almighty God. To contend for them is not to seek to exploit our own interpretation. It is to contend for an authoritative interpretation from the living God.

Finally, because the League of Evangelical Students is contending for *God's* interpretation of the facts of the Christian faith, it cannot but be contending on the side of truth. We have the highest possible reason which can be given for the truth of anything; namely, "thus saith the Lord." At best we can but muster all the opinions of men against God's revelation. That would not alter the truth of God's interpretation. The supernatural interpretation as revealed by God would still remain unalterably true. "Forever O Lord Thy Word is settled in heaven." And for that Word we unashamedly and militantly contend—confident and comforted in the thought that we proclaim not the wisdom of men but in very surety the wisdom of the living God.

C. K. C.

THE MODERN STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT—IS IT CHRISTIAN?

Through the wide cooperation of the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and the Student Volunteer Movement there is being launched in various regions throughout America a movement known as The Student Christian Movement. Already the Middle Atlantic Region, the New England Region, and the Rocky Mountain Region have definitely formed "an inclusive Student Christian Movement" for their respective regions. Less success seems to have accompanied the efforts put forth in other sections of the country.

It is significant to note in passing that if the "tentative basis for immediate action" as set forth by the first General Assembly of the "Student Christian Movement in the Middle Atlantic Region" is made a permanent basis for action, the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. in such regions will in reality no longer exist autonomously. They will each be subordinate agencies of this higher movement. This is seen from the fact that the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. are "to delegate their program functions for the coming year to the Executive Council of the Student Christian Movement. Local Associations as well as other groups and individuals which formerly contributed to the support of the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A., are encouraged . . . for this experimental year to make their

contributions through the Student Christian Movement"¹ The same will be the fate of the Student Volunteer Movement when the Policy of Cooperation as adopted by the Ninth General Council of the Student Volunteer Movement is realized—"That we work toward the further integration of our Movement with the emerging student Christian movements . . ." ² The aim clearly is to bring all campus organizations which have retained the faintest aroma of the spirit of Jesus under the influence and control of one central bureaucracy. This should at least clarify the modern issues on the campus.

The fundamental question is not the organizational aspect of the Movement. Our concern is whether or not the Student Christian Movement is Christian in the historic sense of the word. How does the doctrinal position of this Movement compare with the doctrines of Christianity as found in the Word of God?

Statements of purpose have been adopted by various regions of this Christian Student Movement. The editor has selected the statement of purpose as adopted by the Student Christian Movement of the Middle Atlantic Region as a representative statement. The statements of the New England and the Rocky Mountain regions might be considered even less Christian. The statement of the Middle Atlantic Region reads—

"The Student Christian Movement in the Middle Atlantic region is an active fellowship of men and women who desire to be definitely, personally, radically Christian and to join in the endeavor to make real the life, principles, and teachings of Jesus among students, especially in relation to individual lives, to racial, political, economic, national, international, and other aspects of our modern campus and world society and with resultant loyalty and commitment to Jesus Christ as preeminently the revealer of the character of God and the answer to the needs of the world."³

This statement manifests that it is not Christian in the first place by what it fails to state. By its utter failure to mention one cardinal fact or doctrine of historic Christianity such as Christ's death for our redemption or Christ's bodily resurrection for our justification this Movement has quietly assumed that a person may be a perfectly good Christian and not adhere to one single supernatural fact or doctrine of Scripture. As a consequence there is nothing in this statement of purpose which an orthodox Mohammedan cannot assent to. What claim then has this Movement to the name Christian? It has no more rightful claim to that name than the followers of the false prophet. In the enthusiasm for the principles and teachings of Jesus they have ignored the central teaching of Jesus around which all others are woven—His claim to be God and the only Saviour of mankind.

This statement, however, manifests most clearly that it is not Christian by what it positively affirms; namely, that "Christ is preeminently the revealer of God." This is to deny the very words of the sinless Christ. Christ made unmistakably clear that he was preeminently the Saviour of man. Said Christ—"I am come to seek and to save that which was lost," "I came . . . to give my life a ransom for many," "I am come not to do mine own will but the will of Him that sent me. And this is the will of Him that sent me that of all which

1. *"The Student Christian Movement in the Middle Atlantic Region"*—pamphlet, p. 8.

2. *"The Intercollegian and Far Horizons,"* November, 1934, p. 51.

3. *"The Student Christian Movement in the Middle Atlantic Region"*—pamphlet, p. 6.

He hath given me I should lose none, but should raise it up again at the last day. And this is the will of Him that sent me that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him may have everlasting life and I will raise him up at the last day." Certainly Christ spoke an entirely different lingo from the modern Student Christian Movement.

The saddest feature of it all is to note that so many denominational institutions founded by Christians for the propagation of a redeeming Christ join in sponsoring this anti-Christian Movement. We note the names of such institutions as Gettysburg Lutheran Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Pittsburgh Theological Seminary as having representatives on the Executive Council of this movement. May God keep the chapters and branches of the League of Evangelical Students free from making common cause in any way with this Movement which denies the only begotten of God and man's only Saviour.

C. K. C.

THE PERIL OF THE EVANGELICAL STUDENT

There is one perilous pitfall which constantly besets the evangelical student. This is the pitfall of anti-intellectualism. In the class room the student hears theories which at times seem to shake the very foundations of his faith. Doubts and problems rush in like a flood. At such a time there is the danger that the student will seek an easy way of escape by fleeing from the disturbing questions and retiring into some self-satisfying emotional experience. With Schleiermacher the liberal theologian he seeks authority for his beliefs in feeling or experience rather than in the Word of God. This clearly is mysticism and mysticism at its roots is skepticism. The result of false mysticism is a sickening superficiality in the student's knowledge of Divine truth.

There is a simple way whereby the evangelical student may escape this peril. That is to face the theories devised to undermine a belief in Christianity and—relying on the Holy Spirit to enlighten—to go to the Word of God, to the writings of Christian scholars, and to the rich treasures of interpretation as found in the doctrines and theology of the Christian Church and wrestle with the problem. As this is done, more and more the student will come to clear convictions on the truths of God's Word and will come to a deeper and richer understanding of the meaning of these truths. His mind and heart will receive truths which will edify his own faith and make it possible for him to be an intelligent defender and proclaimer of the Word of God among his fellow students.

Christian students on various campuses are found to be longing for and praying for a revival in their midst, and certainly no prayer is more appropriate than just such a prayer. But as we pray may God keep us mindful that there never can be a revival of the work of God until there is first a widespread and thorough knowledge of the Word of God. The Holy Spirit is mighty and sovereign but without the Word there can be no knowledge of or acceptance of man's only Savior—the only basis of true revival.

C. K. C.

COMPROMISING THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE*

R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D.

Few men who lay claim to Christianity deny outright the authority of the Bible. Even the so-called advanced modernist hardly does that.

Eventually the logic of the modernist's position must drive him to the rejection of all external authority. Present-day liberalism is deeply indebted to Hegel. It is hardly an exaggeration to call him its philosophical father. But Hegelianism is thoroughly pantheistic. Did not Hegel style the human will a *Wirkungsform* of the divine will and boldly declare, "What I do God does"? Modernism too is pantheistic. It reduces the difference between Christ's Divinity and man's to one of degree only. It gloats over the divinity of man. Recently a liberal minister preached on *The Other Me*, who turned out to be none other than God.

But, obviously, thoroughgoing pantheism leaves no room for external authority. If I am God, I will majestically decline to take orders from another. If I am God, I am my own authority.

If, on the other hand, I am merely a finite human being, it behooves me to give heed to the voice of the Infinite. And if I am not merely finite but also sinful, so sinful in fact, that I cannot possibly save myself from sin and its consequences, it emphatically behooves me to obey the orders which God gives me in the Bible for my salvation.

Let us say that you are bathing in the surf at Atlantic City. Imagine President Roosevelt in bathing near you. I do not suppose that he swims in public places, but let us assume for the sake of argument that he is there. He gets caught in the undertow and is being carried away. You notice his perilous plight, run for a life-saver and throw it out to him, all the while, of course, holding the attached rope in your hands. Now what do you say to Mr. Roosevelt? Do you address him thus: "My dear Mr. President, I observe that you find yourself in a sorry plight indeed; you are in imminent peril of finding a watery grave. Now your lowly servant has determined to put forth a concerted effort to prevent so great a calamity. May he not humbly beseech your honor to condescend to lay hold on the circular object which he is casting in your direction, in order that he may have the unusual honor of rescuing your esteemed person"? Or will you simply shout at him: "Hey there, grab that life-saver"? Of course you will do the latter. And I assure you that the President will not resent your language.

Listen! If the President of the greatest republic on the face of the globe will not think of objecting if you, an ordinary citizen, issue orders to him in an effort to save him from drowning, would it not be the height of folly, folly beyond compare, if you and I, puny human beings that we are, should refuse to recognize the authority of the King of kings and Lord of lords, with whom all the nations of earth are as a drop of a bucket or the small dust of the balance, yea less than nothing and vanity, when he commands us what we are to do in order that we may be saved from everlasting perdition?

But, as I have said, very few men, if any, who would be known as Christians deny the authority of the Bible outright today. Many there are, however, who compromise it. Compromise looks so much less wicked and also less perilous than denial. As a matter of fact it is fraught with even greater danger.

* An address delivered at the Ninth Annual Convention of the League at Boston, Massachusetts.

There are at least two ways of destroying a house. One method is to carry several sticks of dynamite into the basement and to blow up the whole thing in a moment. That is a quick and effective way. Another way is to break the house down, one brick or one board at a time, or if one should begin at the roof, for a long time just one shingle a day. This is a far slower method, but in the end it proves equally effective. And it undeniably has one great advantage over the other method. It is much less shocking to the sensibilities of the occupants of the house, and for that reason one has a much better chance of getting away with it. If I should catch a man carrying dynamite into my home, I should lose no time calling the police. If I should see a man breaking an occasional shingle from the roof, I should wonder and I might object, but I should hardly think it worth while to fly into a frenzy.

The great deceiver is clever. He does not try to smash the Bible at one blow with an axe; he prefers to cut it up little by little with a penknife. This is so much less shocking to those who love the book, and therefore the danger of interference is so much smaller and the likelihood of success so much greater.

I shall call attention to several ways in which men, evidently under the influence of the deceiver, are compromising the authority of the Bible.

* * * * *

I. *Men compromise the authority of the Bible by setting up another authority alongside it; in other words, by denying the sole authority of the Bible.*

The Roman Catholic Church has been doing this for centuries already. It speaks of two infallibles: the Bible and the Church. It claims to have not only an infallible Bible, but also an infallible interpretation of the Bible by the Church.

Now if Rome went no farther than to assert that it has an infallible interpretation of the Bible, we Protestants would surely have to differ because we know of no ground for this belief, but a few of us might regard this view somewhat sympathetically. Who of us in moments of indolence has not wished for an infallible interpretation of Scripture? How much arduous exegetical labor would be spared us students and ministers if we had within easy reach an infallible interpretation of God's Word! Again, how much theological strife this would obviate! And debating is hard work.

However, Rome does not stop at this claim. It proceeds to add to the Bible many traditions. Even thus the worst has not been said. Several of these traditions contradict the teaching of Scripture. Belief in the immaculate conception of Mary, for instance, can hardly be reconciled with the biblical doctrine of the universality of sin. And the invention of purgatory simply does not square with the scriptural teaching that the soul on departing from the body goes at once to its eternal destination. So tradition is actually placed above the Bible.

The mystics of the Christian Church, too, have set up another authority alongside the Bible. In their case it is not the Church, but what is designated by that fine-sounding phrase, the Christian consciousness.

Nor have the mystics been satisfied to place the Christian consciousness on a par with the Bible. Fact is that many of them have exalted it above the inscripturated Word. They think more of the inner light than of objective revelation.

The mystic is a good deal like a man receiving a telegram, glancing at it, and casting it aside with the remark, "I have a radio set of my own." It does not seem to occur to him that the telegram may contain a message which does not come over the radio at all. As a matter of fact, does not the Bible tell us many

things of which the Christian consciousness apart from the Bible knows nothing? What knowledge has the Christian consciousness by itself of the origin of the universe and the fact of Christ's bodily resurrection? Precisely none, of course. For our knowledge of these and the other historical events which constitute the very foundation of Christianity we are dependent altogether on the Bible.

In the case of both the Roman Catholic and the mystic it is extremely interesting to compare their conclusion with their premise. Both start out by placing another authority alongside the Bible. Both end up by exalting the other authority above the Bible.

The explanation is obvious.

It lies, on the one hand, in the irresistible force of sound logic. Is it not self-evident that one cannot possibly honor two authorities as supreme? The expression *two supremes* is a contradiction in terms. Every attempt to set up two ultimate authorities is bound to fail. It must of necessity result either in the deposition of both or in the deposition of one by its subjection to the other. You will recall that the ancient Greeks and Romans in their mythologies ascribed limitations and imperfections to the gods. Give them credit for their logic. This peculiar theology was the inevitable consequence of their polytheism. By all the rules of logic there can be but one absolute, but one infinite, but one supreme.

So the force of logic accounts for it that the Roman Catholic and the mystic have found it impossible to maintain two supreme authorities. It must be added that the corrupt nature of man will go a long way toward accounting for the fact that, when they had to subject one to the other, both made the wrong choice. Instead of subjecting the Church and the Christian consciousness to the Bible they did the opposite.

Will you pardon a rather trite illustration and a story?

The Word of God teaches clearly and emphatically that the husband is the head of his wife. But nowadays there is a strong tendency to place the two on a par. Brides are no longer as willing as they used to be to promise obedience to bridegrooms. It is often said that the mother has as much right to be the head of the family as has the father. Let me assure you that when you hear married couples speak in this vein there is something wrong. If each is the head of the family, neither is, or, what is much more likely, the wrong one is.

A couple were celebrating their silver wedding anniversary. They were known as an exceptionally happy couple. It was reported that they had never once had words in a quarter century of wedded life. One of the guests made bold to inquire of the male celebrant as to the secret of such unwonted peace. Came the reply: "It is very simple. When we entered upon wedlock we agreed that in all important matters that might arise in our married life I was to have my way, and in all minor matters my better half was to have her way. Now it so happens that in the course of the past twenty-five years not one important matter has come up."

To place another authority alongside the Bible constitutes a denial of the Bible's supreme authority and is pretty sure to issue in the subjection of the Bible to this other authority.

* * * * *

II. *Men compromise the authority of the Bible by ascribing authority to certain parts of it only; in other words, by denying the inclusive authority of the Bible.*

It obviously makes a world of difference whether one grants that the Word of God is in the Bible or holds that the Bible is the Word of God. A man has a

piece of metallic substance in his hand. Whether it has gold in it or is gold may make a difference of several hundreds of dollars. In the former case as little as one percentage of it may be gold, in the latter it is a gold nugget. So to say that the Word of God is in the Bible may mean next to nothing.

It goes without saying that due allowance must be made for textual criticism. But if, this done, it be maintained that not everything in the Bible is the authoritative Word of God, the question arises what is?

There are those who insist that only the New Testament, not the Old, is the Word of God. They find not a fuller revelation of the one true God in the New Testament, but a God who differs radically from the Jehovah of the Old. But the absurdity of this view is self-evident. As Bishop Wordsworth has pointed out in his valuable work on the Canon, the New Testament canonizes the Old. Does not the New Testament say, for instance, with reference to the Old that "the Scripture cannot be broken"?

Others tell us that only the words of the Lord Jesus in the New Testament constitute the Word of God. This view quite ignores the promise given by Christ to the disciples that the Holy Spirit would lead them into the truth. It also suggests the question—call it naive if you will—how we may know that the words of the Lord Jesus are correctly recorded in the gospel according to John, let us say, if John did not write infallibly. If only Jesus was infallible, do we have his words? Surely, if we are not sure of having Jesus' infallible words, their infallibility boots us little.

May I remark here that personally I do not like the idea of certain publishers of the Bible to print the Savior's words in red. This device is apt to leave a wrong impression with the reader. There is danger, I take it, that he will regard Jesus' words as the Word of God in a fuller and more real sense than the words of the apostles and prophets, which is not the case if the whole Bible is the Word of God.

Not long ago a modernist preacher told me in conversation that to his mind the teaching of Jesus was just about right. His only objection was that Jesus took hell a little too seriously. Apart from that minor criticism he was prepared to put the stamp of his approval on the words of the great teacher.

Was it not the liberal Harnack who after much study came to the conclusion that the part of Jesus' teaching which is commonly called the Sermon on the Mount constitutes the Word of God?

Not even Karl Barth, the stalwart German opponent of liberal theology, will grant unqualifiedly that the Bible is the Word of God. He teaches in effect that it is the source of the Word of God and that it actually is the Word of God for me only when God speaks to my heart through it.

Modernist and mediating ministers like to say nowadays that the Bible comes to us with supreme authority in spiritual matters only, and that its references to history and science may be, and in certain cases likely are, quite faulty. That position is taken, for instance, by the well known Pearl Buck, until recently a missionary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. She is said to have made the bold declaration that, even if it should be proved that Jesus never existed as a historical character, this would have little, if any, bearing on the continuance of Christianity, since the spirit of Christ would go marching on just the same. Has it occurred to you how flatly she contradicted the chief of the apostles? Wrote Paul in First Corinthians fifteen: "If Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain; your faith also is vain; ye are yet in your sins; they also that are fallen asleep in Christ have perished." Evidently it was Paul's firm

conviction that Christianity is a religion of fact, that the structure of Christianity rests upon historical events, and if this foundation were destroyed, that the whole edifice would topple into ruins like a house of cards. If Paul was right—and we Christians are convinced that he was—then to deny the authority of the Bible in matters of history is to deny its authority altogether.

That brings us to our last remark under this head. I have already indicated that to compromise the authority of the Bible by setting up another authority alongside it leads to the denial of biblical authority. Now I must add that to compromise the authority of the Bible by ascribing authority to certain portions of it only, leads inevitably to the same conclusion.

How obvious! If it be assumed that not everything in the Bible is the Word of God, who is going to decide which parts of the Bible are the Word of God and which are not? But one answer is possible. Man will have to do the choosing. Every individual, I suppose, will have to decide for himself. But thus man is elevated to the position of arbiter. He now stands in judgment over the Bible. And that is another way of saying that the Bible is no longer his authoritative judge.

There is a good story of an army in flight, with the enemy in hot pursuit. The foe never ceased firing, and one man after another in the defeated army was shot down. Finally, however, a safe retreat was reached. Only, when the fleeing army arrived at this retreat not a single soldier remained. Much the same thing will happen to the Bible of him who permits the enemies of God to deprive him of one page today on the ground that it is not God's Word and of another tomorrow on the same ground. When, after a while, he thinks that finally he has come down to the very Word of God in the Bible, he will make the disconcerting discovery that his Bible consists of nothing but two covers and a back.

To say that not the whole Bible is the Word of God is to deny that the Bible is God's Word.

* * * * *

III. *Men compromise the authority of the Bible by modifying the nature of its authority; in other words, by denying its sovereign authority.*

The orthodox Christian asserts that the Bible is the very Word of the living God and therefore comes to men with divine, sovereign, authority. But many there are today who assure us that the Bible has the authority of an expert only.

The ancient Greeks were expert in art and literature. The old Romans were expert in war and law. So, we are told, the Hebrews were expert in religion. For some reason or other, perhaps because of their exceptional mental acumen, the Hebrews, it is said, had a remarkably deep insight into the things of the spirit and an amazingly advanced conception of the supreme being. For example, it dawned on them sooner than on any other people that God is one. Monotheism is their great contribution to the progress of the human race. Some of the most religious of these religious Hebrews recorded their thoughts and experiences in writing. These writings were collected in the book known as the Old Testament.

It was Schleiermacher who said that the New Testament is the record of the religious experiences of the early Christians, and he added that the experiences of one of them did not necessarily harmonize with those of another.

With reference to the Bible there is no more basic question confronting us than this one: Is it the record of man's groping for God and, as many like to say, of man's discovery of God; or is it the record of God's revelation of himself to man? In the former case it is the word of man to man about God; in the latter

case it is the Word of God about himself to man. If the latter is true, the Bible comes with sovereign authority; if the former is true, it has at best the authority of an expert.

The essential difference between Christianity and other religions can pointedly be stated thus: In all other religions man is feeling after God; in Christianity alone God comes to man, speaks to man, tells man who he, God, is.

Every once in a while one reads the statement that the Bible is not a book but a library. How misleading! A library is a collection of books by different authors, as a rule. A book is most often the work of one author. The Bible has many human authors, to be sure; but it has only one primary author, God the Holy Spirit. The Bible is emphatically a book. It is the only book in all the world with perfect unity.

Let us seek to discover to what conclusion the tenet leads that the Bible has the authority of an expert only.

We shall assume that I am involved in serious problems of a financial or economic nature. As I am planning my trip from Philadelphia to Boston, where I am to attend this convention of the League of Evangelical Students, it occurs to me that the train will take me through Hartford, Connecticut, the city of that great authority on economics, Irving Fisher. I decide to stop over for an hour of consultation with him about my difficulties. Well and good. The prospect of receiving expert advice eases my mind. I am feeling fine.

Having purchased a magazine at the station, I board my train. I nestle down in my seat and begin to read. My attention is drawn to an article on that perennial subject, the depression. Something is said about the fact that few of our leading economists saw the collapse approaching. A statement is made to the effect that even Irving Fisher of Yale a comparatively short time before the crash of 1929 predicted continued prosperity. I am shocked. My worries return. So not even the opinions of Irving Fisher, the famous expert, are fool-proof. What reason have I to suppose that his advice to me will prove sound? One thing is certain, it will not be infallible.

If the Bible has the authority of an expert only, it is not infallible. It may well err on many points. Its authority is far from ultimate.

* * * * *

We have considered three ways in which men compromise the authority of the Bible, and in each instance we have seen that compromise is in principle denial.

The question is not whether we shall perhaps after a little have to be satisfied with half a Bible, but whether we shall have any Bible at all. The question is not whether we may possibly have to sacrifice part of our patrimony, but whether we shall be reduced to direst poverty. The question is not whether we may have to lose our baggage in a storm at sea, but whether we shall have to go down, passengers and crew, into a watery grave. The question is not whether our sun may suffer a partial eclipse, but whether we shall be plunged into Stygian darkness forever.

Compromise is denial.

Therefore we must choose.

Which will we do: honor the Bible unqualifiedly as the Word of God or reject it?

Which will we have: Christianity or paganism?

THE WRITERS IN THIS ISSUE

R. B. KUIPER, A.M., B.D. Professor Kuiper is the President of the Board of Trustees of the League of Evangelical Students. He is the author of numerous books. Formerly President of Calvin College he is now Professor of Practical Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Professor Kuiper was for a number of years a minister in the Christian Reformed Church and is considered by many one of the foremost preachers of Reformed Theology in America today.

OSWALD T. ALLIS, Ph.D., D.D. Dr. Allis is the former editor of the *Princeton Theological Review* and at present associate editor of *The Evangelical Quarterly* (Edinburg). His precision and fairness in every detail has won for him the highest respect of friend and foe. Dr. Allis has written numerous articles for publication from time to time, but certainly none has been more timely than the present one on "The Short Bible." It is no ordinary privilege to have one of such singular scholarship write for the *Student*. Dr. Allis is Professor of Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary.

FLOYD E. HAMILTON, B.D., Th.M. Professor Hamilton is the Professor of Bible at Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea. He is the author of the noted book on evolution *The Basis of Evolutionary Faith*. He has also written *The Basis of Christian Faith*. Having come through the experience of losing his own faith while in college, he has been used in an unusual way to assist the college student in the doubts so common to the student mind. The reader will find the books of Professor Hamilton convincing and clear.

MELVIN A. STUCKEY, Th.M. Professor Stuckey writes for the first time in the *Student*. He is Professor of Practical Theology at Ashland Seminary, Ashland, Ohio. He is the Moderator-elect of The Brethren Church. Professor Stuckey had an influential part in the infant days of the League at Princeton Seminary. He is now meeting with singular blessing and success in his work among the students of Ashland Seminary and College.

JACK DEVRIES, A.B. Mr. DeVries is a graduate of Calvin College and at present is a student in Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia. Mr. DeVries is a student and preacher of more than unusual ability. He has contributed some very worthwhile thoughts in his article which every evangelical student does well to consider.

AN ANNOUNCEMENT for Ministers and Christian Leaders

There are two definite ways in which you can assist the League's testimony to the everlasting Gospel. One is to send the names of any substantial Christians of your congregation who are attending college. The other is to afford an opportunity for the Field Secretary to preach or speak to God's people concerning this most sadly neglected field of missionary opportunity—the student-world.

THE SHORT BIBLE—ITS MEANING AND MENACE*

OSWALD T. ALMS, PH.D., D.D.

How can a *short* Bible be a menace? There are many books on the market which contain only part of the Bible—the Psalms, a single Gospel, the four Gospels, the New Testament. There are also books which contain selections from the Bible, favorite chapters, portions especially appropriate for the sick-room, the house of mourning, etc. A part is never equal to the whole. But such books serve a useful purpose, are handy and helpful. How then can a short Bible be a menace? The answer may seem difficult, but it is easy.

There are short Bibles and short Bibles.

Whether they are a blessing or the opposite will depend on what they *keep* and what they *leave out*.

THE WORK OF CHICAGO UNIVERSITY

I am to speak to you about what is probably the most recent "short Bible," one which was published by the *Chicago University Press* last October. It represents an abridgment of the so-called American translation of the Bible which was published several years ago; "so-called," because the book has no right to such an ambitious title. Every one of its editors was more or less closely connected with Chicago University. Drs. Powis Smith and Goodspeed being professors in that institution. It should properly be called "a Chicago University" translation, for it bears the imprimatur of that institution in an unofficial but very definite way.

I.

Let us now turn to the *Short Bible* and examine it as fully as our time will permit. It is about a *quarter* the size of the Bible. One-sixth of the Old Testament is retained and one-half of the New, which makes it one of the shortest "Bibles" yet published. It is about half the size of the *Shorter Bible* which Professor Kent of Yale published a decade or so ago.

A MUTILATED PENTATEUCH

We will begin with the Pentateuch. Only a little more than a sixth has been preserved, most of which is from Genesis and the first half of Exodus. Of the great section beginning with Exodus 24 and running through Deuteronomy, which constitutes about three-fifths of the Pentateuch, only five chapters or portions of chapters have been retained—5 out of 114!

Why is this? The answer is significant. The second half of Exodus deals largely with the tabernacle, the instructions for its construction given to Moses, the carrying out of those instructions, the erection of the tabernacle, and its acceptance by the God of Israel. Through the closing chapters there run like a great refrain (repeated nearly a score of times) the words, "as the Lord commanded Moses," as if to prove beyond all peradventure that, as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews expresses it, Moses carried out the command, "See, saith he, thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount."

* *Abridgment of an address at Moody Bible Institute Founder's Week Conference, February 5, 1934. Reprinted through the courtesy of the Moody Bible Institute Monthly.*

AN IMAGINARY TEMPLE

Now it is the view of the destructive critics—emphatically expressed by Wellhausen—that this tabernacle never had any existence. The real Mosaic tabernacle they say, was the temporary tent mentioned in Exodus 33:7, but not described in any way, a simple nomad's tent. The elaborate structure described in detail in Exodus is simply imaginary. Priests of the exilic or post-exilic period felt there must have been a tabernacle in the days of Moses comparable to Solomon's temple, so they imagined a kind of "portable" temple, a tent-temple as it were, and worked it out in great detail, but it never really existed! Is it any wonder then that this whole account is omitted by the shorteners? Why burden the *Short Bible* with the details of a great tabernacle that is made out of moonshine and rainbow?

But this is not all. The book of Leviticus and considerable parts of Numbers and Deuteronomy contain the laws of the ritual to be observed at this tabernacle. If the tabernacle didn't exist, how about the ritual? The critics would probably prefer to state it the other way round; the laws are late but are attributed to Moses. The attributing of the laws to Moses made it necessary to attribute a portable temple to him also. So the situation is this. The tabernacle never existed at all; the laws and institutions were unknown till centuries after Moses. Consequently the shorteners omit nearly all of Leviticus and Numbers and Deuteronomy, which attribute to Moses a tabernacle and a code of laws with which he had little or nothing to do.

NO ATONEMENT BY BLOOD

But we must remember that the very heart and core of the Mosaic law was the ritual of sacrifice. "It is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul," we read in Leviticus 17:11, and when we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, that great New Testament commentary on the Mosaic ceremonial law, we read, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission" (9:22). We have seen already that very little of the 114 chapters (Exod. 25 to Deut. 34) has been retained—less than five complete chapters. In the case of Leviticus we have only twenty-seven verses—a verse for a chapter we are tempted to say. Of Hebrews we have about one-third retained, but of that great central doctrinal section which deals with the fulfillment of the Old Testament ritual of priestly sacrifice in the atoning, high priestly death of Christ, little remains. Of the 150 verses between 3:7 and 10:18 only 10 verses are retained. The verse I have quoted is not among them.

NO ARK OF THE COVENANT

The most sacred of all the vessels of the tabernacle was the ark. The ark of the covenant, or the ark of the testimony, as it is frequently called, is mentioned nearly two hundred times in the Old Testament. It stood in the Holy of Holies and it was there that once a year, on the Day of Atonement, the high priest, entering the most holy place, might make atonement for his own sins and the sins of the people by sprinkling blood upon the mercy seat which covered the ark.

How many times do you suppose the ark is mentioned in the Old Testament portion of the *Short Bible*? Once! Once out of nearly two hundred times. And where is it mentioned? In Leviticus 16 which tells of the Day of Atonement? No, but merely in the story of the boy Samuel sleeping beside the ark! And how

about Hebrews 9 which deals particularly with the ark and with the New Testament meaning of the Day of Atonement? The whole chapter is omitted.

NO SAVING FAITH

Reject the type and logically you will reject the antitype. In the proportion that you reject the law of Moses will you reject the Epistle to the Hebrews. That this is not a matter of theory is illustrated by the treatment of the Epistle to the Romans. Of the great doctrinal section (chs. 1-14), scarcely a third has been preserved. Yet among these we find chapter 5 and chapter 8, the latter reduced about one-half! Apparently it did not seem wise to omit them. But although 3:27-31 is retained, the immediately preceding verses are omitted. Let me read them to you in the familiar rendering of the Authorized Version.

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.”

Now with these verses still in your ears let me read you what the New Testament editor, Dr. Goodspeed, describes in his brief introduction to the excerpts from this epistle contained in the *Short Bible*, as “the great features of the Christian faith” as Paul sees them:

“Jew and Greek alike have fallen short of the truest uprightness, but a way to such uprightness has now been revealed through Christ. It is the way of faith—that inner attitude of trust and dependence upon God which must be the germ of any real achievement in character. God has forgiven the world, and man has only to accept that forgiveness through faith, and live the life of the spirit.”

You notice how sadly this devitalizes the great doctrines of redemption as taught by Paul. Dr. Goodspeed seems concerned to substitute faith as a Christian virtue for that faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord which is of the essence of Christianity.

II.

I cannot speak fully about the shortness of the *Short Bible* because there are other and equally important matters which must not be overlooked. But there are some things that must be said before we pass on. Let me remind you that one of the distinctive glories of our Christian religion is that it is a historical religion, not a mere philosophy, but a record of great redemptive acts of God: the Bible is a history of redemption. In the Old Testament we speak of the books Joshua to Esther, as the historical books. Together they constitute about one-third of the Old Testament. They have 249 chapters. Of these we find in the *Short Bible* only 12 complete chapters and 8 incomplete. Of the 12 the book of Ruth contributes 2, Esther, 4—one-half of the 12.

If you want to know what the higher critics think of the Old Testament as history, this book will give a pretty satisfactory answer. David was a rather conspicuous figure in Old Testament history we might think. The books of Samuel and I Chronicles deal largely with David for example, and 73 of the Psalms are attributed to him by the titles. In the *Short Bible* we have from both books of Samuel only the story of the slaying of Goliath (I Sam. 17) and David's lament over Saul and Jonathan (II Sam. 1:17-27)!

DAVID'S REIGN A BLANK

The books of Chronicles are entirely omitted, it being one of the fundamentals of higher criticism that they are quite unhistorical. Also only four of the Psalms which bear David's name are retained. His reign is a complete blank. What conception of David can we gather from these glimpses of him retained in the *Short Bible*? And what of the 39 kings who followed him, the 20 who sat upon his throne, and the 19 who reigned over northern Israel? Two of them, Ahab and Jehu, appear in the brief excerpts from the Elijah stories, but for all the others we have only the few references contained in some of the prophetic portions.

You may still read in Matthew 6:29 of "Solomon in all his glory," or rather, "splendor," to quote exactly. But you will search in vain for an explanation of this apt historical allusion. The Old Testament passages of the *Short Bible* contain only one mention of Solomon (Neh. 13:26) and the New Testament selections contain but this one, except for the two mentions of Solomon's colonade (John 10:23; Acts 5:12). Our Lord is not allowed to refer to the visit of the Queen of Sheba—which is of course unhistorical in their view, and Stephen is not even allowed to mention that Solomon built the temple.

What possible excuse is there for this kind of treatment, unless it be that the Old Testament is regarded as almost utterly worthless and unprofitable as history? We have been hearing of the "German Christians" who want to do away with the Old Testament. Before we lament the depravity of Teutonic human nature let us remind ourselves that our own higher critics are only a step behind.

THE POETS AND THE PROPHETS

Of the poetical books it is to be noted that only 15 of the 150 Psalms are retained: the Royal Psalms, the Penitentials, even the Fifty-first are missing, also the One Hundred and third and the One Hundred and thirty-ninth. Proverbs, a few selections; Ecclesiastes, the last chapter and parts of three others; Job, six chapters; Song of Songs, none. This is the record for the poetical books.

Of the prophets the record is brief. Of Isaiah, the great evangelical prophet, about one-sixth is retained, 4 whole chapters out of 66 and parts of 20 others, usually only a few verses. Jeremiah's 52 chapters are reduced to one with parts of five others. Of Ezekiel's 48 only 6 remain, 3 complete and 3 incomplete. Daniel fares rather better, with 4 out of its 12 retained. While of the 67 chapters in the so-called Minor Prophets 15 are retained entire with parts of 15 others.

WHAT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

When we turn to the New Testament we observe that, as was to be expected, the process of destruction has not been carried as far as in the Old. Half of the

New Testament is retained. Of the four Gospels, Mark has suffered least, losing only a few verses. The others have lost about a half, Luke considerably more. Acts is reduced about a third. The Pauline epistles each lose at least a third, but Romans loses nearly three-fourths, I and II Timothy suffer yet more heavily. Hebrews loses nearly two-thirds, and Revelation three-fourths. The least that can be said regarding such a drastic curtailment of Scripture is that it defeats its own avowed purpose. It makes the Bible too fragmentary to be intelligible.

III.

But the editors have not been content with merely curtailing the Bible, they have submitted it to an equally radical rearrangement. This also is the natural result of the application of higher critical principles to the Bible. That the Pentateuch is not Mosaic, but a compilation from at least five different documents, the oldest of which dates from about the time of Jehoshaphat, the latest and largest, the one containing the bulk of the law, from the time of the exile or later—this has long been an accepted and assured result of higher criticism.

PLACING THE LAW AFTER THE PROPHETS

According to this view the religion of Israel was not very different from that of neighboring peoples until centuries after the time of Moses. David was a rude warrior whose religious beliefs were so crude that we cannot regard him as the author of any of the Psalms, at least in their *present* form. Jeroboam was simply a religious conservative who adhered to tradition-honored custom in establishing the calf-worship at Dan and Bethel. It was the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries who were the real founders, or we may say, discoverers of ethical monotheism.

The dictum of the critics is first the prophets, then the law. The familiar and historical order which puts the Pentateuch, as Mosaic, first, they regard as a mistake, the result of the perversion of history practiced by the Jews in attributing all their laws to Moses and glorifying their past in a way for which there was no warrant in fact. Israelitish monotheism does not begin with Moses or with Abraham. It begins with Amos and Hosea. Indeed, we should perhaps regard Jeremiah as the first theoretical monotheist, they would say.

But you will object, Do not the historical books, Joshua to Nehemiah, refer repeatedly to the law of Moses? Yes, but you must give the Jews credit for at least a modicum of common sense, is their argument. If the law though actually late was to be made Mosaic with a view to glorifying the past, then the history of that past must of course be "written up" from the same standpoint! Otherwise the Pentateuch and historical Books would be in glaring conflict. If Deuteronomy was really "composed secretly in the half-heathen reign of Manasseh" and was simply attributed to Moses in order to secure the authority of this half-legendary hero for its new and revolutionary doctrines, then of course the old history books had to be revised and rewritten to enable this forgery or "pious fraud," as it has been called, to establish itself in the eyes of the masses!

HOW THE "FRAUD" WAS WORKED

This pious work of rewriting history went on industriously during the exile and afterwards, the Pentateuch being completed perhaps by Ezra—and the historical books reaching their final form about the same time. And the work

was so well done that until about a century ago, everybody believed that the account the Bible gave of itself was true. In fact, despite all that the critics have done to prove the contrary most people who really read the Bible and love it, are taken in by this plausible account which it gives. It is only the sharp-eyed critic who can read between the lines and see things in their true light. Consequently it is of the utmost importance to the critics to make the Bible say what they want it to say. This the *Short Bible* endeavors to do.

WHERE WE FIND GENESIS

It begins with fragments of Amos, Hosea, and Micah—a fourth or less of each. Then come Isaiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, also reduced in volume. Then Deuteronomy, Habakkuk, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. You observe that Deuteronomy is placed with prophets of the Babylonian period. Then we have “snatches” from Samuel, Kings, and Judges (note the order). Then we meet the post-exilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah, followed by (remember the order is chronological) Joel, Ruth, and Job.

And now we are at Genesis. Here in the middle of the Old Testament in the post-exilic period we meet those sublime words, to which all of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation is attuned—words which are the epitome of monotheism: “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.”

No, that is not the case. We do not meet *them* even here. What we read is this: “When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was a desolate waste, with darkness covering the abyss and a tempestuous wind raging over the surface of the waters.” A clumsy translation, that is not new, but goes back to Jewish unbelievers of the Middle Ages, has been adopted in place of the simple familiar rendering of the Authorized Version, a rendering which is found in ancient and modern versions alike.

Why is this rendering preferred by the critic? There is only one answer. It is because it eliminates from these verses the great truth of creation out of nothing. The earth and the abyss and the wind and the waters were all in existence when God “began to create.” The first chapter of Genesis is thus not merely demoted to the post-exilic period, it is even made to teach that pagan dualism, the eternity of matter, which is so utterly destructive of any high and worthy conception of God.

DOES IT MAKE NO DIFFERENCE?

But we are often told that it makes no difference when the books of the Bible were written or who wrote them; their religious value remains the same. Whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or Isaiah the Book of Consolation is of no importance.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. The words, “In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth,” standing where they belong and as they have stood for a score of centuries and more, at the very beginning of God’s revealed Word, strike the key note of that majestic music to which all scripture is attuned, theism, monotheism.

Why do the critics put it down in the post-exilic period? Because—and this is the fundamental reason—because it then agrees with their conception of the development of religion. They hold that in Israel, as elsewhere, it began with animism and passed through the stages of polydemonism, polytheism, henotheism,

and did not reach the monotheistic stage till a comparatively late date. That is the reason the question of the arrangement of the Old Testament books is so vital and this rearrangement is so destructive. It represents and is designed to prove a totally different conception of the religion of the Bible from that which the Bible itself presents.

IV.

We turn to the New Testament. The most obvious feature in the rearrangement is the fact that most of the Pauline epistles are placed first. This is illogical to say the least. Some of the epistles are probably earlier than the earliest of the Gospels; and John's Gospel is of course one of the latest of the New Testament books. But the familiar arrangement—Gospels, Acts, Epistles, Revelation—is a natural and proper one.

The Gospels and Acts, which give us the facts, naturally precede the epistles, which present the doctrines based on those facts. Furthermore, the exact date of most of the New Testament books is not known. And any chronological arrangement would be more or less tentative at best.

The worst feature of this rearrangement is that it rests upon radical theories as to the authorship of a number of the books. Luke and Acts are dated near the close of the first century, or about twenty-five years after the death of Paul. Ephesians, Timothy, and Titus are denied the apostle. The Apocalypse, the Gospel, and epistles of John are not by the "beloved disciple." I Peter and James are also late. You observe how destructive this is of the apostolic authority of the New Testament.

WHY THIS REARRANGEMENT?

The purpose of this rearrangement of the biblical books is plainly stated in the preface. It aims to present "the various books in the chronological order of their composition, so that earlier religious ideas come first and more developed ones later. So arranged," we are told, "the book becomes an introduction to the development of Hebrew and Christian religious thought, and the great messages of the prophets and evangelists stand out in their full originality."

V.

But the editors have not been content with merely mutilating and rearranging the American translation. They have gone a step farther. They have added editorial comment and interpretation. Some fifty-five pages, or about 10 per cent of the book, is devoted to explanatory notes which are prefaced to nearly all the books. It may readily be admitted that so fragmentary and topsy-turvy a book as the *Short Bible* needs plenty of interpretation. If Theseus needed Ariadne's thread to lead him through the mazes of the Cretan labyrinth, how much more does the simple-minded Christian need a word of counsel and advice when he is lost in the mazes of the higher critic's Bible?

But it should be noted that the object of these explanatory introductions is not to help the reader escape from the maze of higher criticism, but rather to entangle him still more deeply in it. If the Bible, even a mutilated, misarranged, and mistranslated Bible, is not utterly destroyed, it still protests against the treatment it has received at the hands of the critics. Consequently the reader must be given a word of counsel and explanation—a pair of critical spectacles, as it were, that he may read what remains of its statements as the critics want

them read. And lest the reader forget to put on these spectacles, that is to read the introductions, they are printed in *larger* type than the biblical text itself, a piece of effrontery which cannot be too severely condemned.

THE EDITOR COUNSELS HIS READERS

The "selections from the books of Chronicles, Nehemiah and Ezra" have one of the longer introductions, it is over a page in length. I want to read you part of it.

"Most of this story had already been told in what we know as II Samuel and I and II Kings. But those narratives were now freely supplemented and exaggerated. The colors of the earlier narratives are deepened, the glories of the past are heightened, and the whole is viewed in the light of the priestly legislation, which had now come to dominate Jewish life. Thus the Jewish mind, at this low ebb in the national fortunes, finds satisfaction in repainting the splendors of its distant past, and glorifying and magnifying its heroic periods. The book is an imaginative priestly recast of Jewish history, prefaced with genealogical lists (chapters 1-9), and has been termed an ecclesiastical chronicle of Jerusalem."

Now, having read the comment let me remind you that of the 65 chapters of Chronicles not a word is retained, while of the 23 chapters of Ezra and Nehemiah, only 2 complete chapters are retained and parts of 3 others. Yet even in reading this meager residuum, the reader must be reminded that he is reading "an imaginative priestly recast of Jewish history."

Similarly the introduction to the book of Judges tells us that in reading of Deborah and Gideon and Samson we must remember that this period "was a shadowy, half-legendary interval between the conquest and the kingdom." Furthermore,

"These adventurous stories were gathered into a book as early as the seventh century, but it was during the exile, under the influence of the religious ideas of Deuteronomy, that the book received substantially its present form, in which the ancient epistles are given a moralizing cast: the Hebrews sin, and in punishment God brings affliction from the neighboring peoples. Then the Hebrews repent, and he raises up a champion who delivers them and judges them through an interval of peace. But they sin again; and the process is repeated."

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

Simply this: The book of Judges describes conditions in what has been aptly called "Israel's iron age," the time between Joshua and Samuel. The narrative represents this period as one which was marked, we may say characterized, by frequent *apostasies* from the true worship of the God of Israel. But in reading even the three chapters selected from its 21, we are cautioned to bear in mind that the book is late, dating from the time of Jeremiah, at which time this period had become half-legendary.

We are also to note that like some "goody-goody" book for children it had been given a "moralizing cast" in the interest of the ideas of a later age. Thus, the book of Judges speaks of idolatry as practiced in the days of the Judges, but it describes it as sinful, an apostasy from the law of Moses which was severely punished again and again. Such statements, says the critic, are quite incorrect.

Idolatry was quite proper in the days of the Judges; it was not till centuries later that the prophets denounced it. But since their views prevailed, the book of Judges was *edited* in such a way as to make the real and lawful worship of that period appear as if it were sinful and apostate. That is the meaning of this explanation!

I need hardly point out to you the tremendous significance which it has for our reading of the Old Testament. If it is true, which it is not, then Jeroboam the son of Nebat, to whom I have referred already, was not the one "who caused Israel to sin." He was simply a religious conservative, who clung perhaps rather too tenaciously to the customs and practices of his ancestors.

GOD'S BIBLE COMPARED WITH MAN'S BIBLE

When we read the Bible in the old familiar version we are impressed with the unity, harmony, and authority with which it speaks. It is a book of singular clarity, beauty, and sublimity of thought. And while there are in it many things difficult to understand, a wayfaring man cannot err therein. When we read the *Short Bible*, we find that it is a babel of many voices. We cannot be sure what it really says, and what it seems to say is not, we are told, what it really means.

The Bible claims to be the Word of God, His precious and perfect revelation of His will to man, the record and the offer of His great salvation. The *Short Bible* tells us that rightly arranged, and we may add rightly interpreted, it is "an introduction to the development of Hebrew and Christian thought."

The two viewpoints are poles apart. The one is historical Christianity, the redemptive supernaturalism of the Bible. The other is Modernism trying to restate Christianity in "modern" terms, in the familiar language of naturalistic evolution. Between the two there is, to use the title of E. J. Pace's most telling Bible cartoon, which appeared in the *Moody Institute Monthly*, "No Middle Ground—Only a Chasm."

The *Short Bible* is one of many attempts, a very subtle one to bridge the chasm, to modernize the Bible.

That is the meaning and menace of the *Short Bible*.

IT CANNOT SUCCEED

We have the sure promise that "the word of our God shall stand forever." But the *Short Bible* can and may destroy the faith of many in that enduring Word. It is therefore a challenge to us as Christians to stand fast in the faith and contend earnestly for the truth of the gospel, and to cherish as our most precious heritage the Bible, the whole Bible, the Holy Bible, that it may be to us and to those who come after us a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path until He come.

TO OUR READERS

The Evangelical Student contains articles which should have a far wider circulation than they do. It is with the humble conviction that God will use these articles and articles of a similar nature in future issues to advance the truth of His Word that the editor suggests that each reader secure one additional subscriber. This will put The Evangelical Student on a self-sustaining basis. Note our change of address.

CAN A CHRISTIAN STUDENT RATIONALLY REJECT EVOLUTION IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE?*

FLOYD E. HAMILTON, B.D., TH.M.

The Christian student usually never makes any personal investigation of the evidence for evolution, but is simply over-awed by the sheer weight of scholarship on the side of evolution, and is paralyzed by the impressive array of materials in the museums of natural history, with their graphic groupings of the evolutionary sequence of different animals and men. The student reasons that since everybody believes in the fact of evolution, only an ignorant can question it, and he doesn't want to be classed among the ignoramous.

A little thought about this matter however, would show him that questions of fact are not decided by majority vote, and that if a thing is false, all the professors in the world can't make it true. Then, too, if he should study the history of science he would come across numberless theories formerly universally believed which are now universally discarded by scientists. When I studied physics and chemistry as recently as 1906 and 1907, all scientists believed that the atoms were indivisible and indestructible, but to-day that theory is as out-of-date as the idea that the earth is flat!

I am more and more convinced that if it can be shown that there is no factual basis for the theory of evolution, the principal ground for opposition to the Christian religion and the Bible will be swept away, and a Christian student will be enabled to feel that he is not an intellectual pariah because he believes in the Bible as the Word of God. I am not going to discuss the question as to whether it is possible for a view of Christian evolution to be reconciled with the Bible. Personally I believe in the hypothetical possibility of such reconciliation if you admit a supernatural intervention in the creation of matter, of life and of the soul of man, but the fact remains that very few scientists would accept such a view of evolution today, and if the facts are, as I believe they are, against any evolution, there is no use wasting time with a hypothetical Christian evolution which might be reconciled with the Bible. If the whole theory can be shown to be false, then the wind will be taken out of the sails of the atheists and unbelievers.

Unquestionably most of the plausibility of the doctrine of evolution is in fact that we see change everywhere in nature. No man in his senses would for a moment deny that new varieties of fruits, vegetables, plants and domestic animals are constantly being originated today, and so when the evolutionist points to all this change and blandly tells us that this proves evolution to be a fact, we can hardly help nodding and agreeing with him. Of course a little thought would show us that to say that there has been evolution from unicellular organisms to all the myriad forms of life which we see around us today because new varieties are being originated today, is a jump that is pure assumption, and a case of the logical fallacy of non sequiter. I will show later on that these new varieties today cannot possibly be evolution, but their very reality lends plausibility to the evolutionist's claim that evolution is a fact.

* *An address (slightly abridged) delivered at the Ninth Annual Convention of the League at Boston, Massachusetts.*

Then the arguments from embryology, classification, comparative anatomy and the Nuttall blood tests all seem conclusive and plausible proof that there has been evolution, until we reflect that there is always an alternative explanation of the facts alleged, namely that God produced the similar forms of life after the same general plan, with variations suitable to each form created. If direct proof of evolution were elsewhere available, of course genetic relationship would explain the fact that the forelegs of various animals and man show similar structure, but the alternative explanation of a God who created the animals according to similar celestial blueprints would account equally well for the observed facts, and the absence of direct evolutionary proof would raise a question about this whole line of evidence based on analogy between different forms.

The alleged evidence from vestigial organs in reality instead of being evidence for evolution is just the contrary, for if there are real vestigial organs formerly used by the individual, this would merely be a loss of characteristics previously possessed and therefore not true evolution. True evolution would always have to be produced by the acquisition of characteristics not previously possessed. As a matter of fact the science of modern cytology and the science of genetics have rendered the old arguments antiquated from vestigial organs and embryology.

The argument from geographical distribution likewise need not detain us long. The hypothesis of creation in a particular locality and spread from thence to other regions accounts for the facts of geographical distribution as well as the hypothesis of evolution. It was not necessary for God to create all the species in one place or on one continent. If species can evolve and then spread to other regions, they could just as easily spread after their creation.

The only really serious evidence for evolution, is after all found in the fossils in the rocks. It is claimed by evolutionists that there have been successive geological ages which can be identified by the fossils in the successive strata, and that in the earliest ages the simplest forms of life only are found, while in the successive ages higher and higher forms of life are found fossil up to the latest strata which contain the higher mammals and man. Thus the evolutionists claim that the fossils in the rocks present visible proof that evolution is a fact.

At first glance one must admit that if the evidence is what they claim, one is almost hypnotized into the belief that evolution must have occurred. Of course, even here, strict candor will compel us to admit that there is at least a possibility that God created the forms of life during the successive ages, and that the days of Genesis Chapter I represented geological ages, during which the forms of life were created. Even the most convinced evolutionist would have to admit that he cannot prove genetic relationship between the fossils of the successive ages. There might have been no connection between the various forms of life at all for all that he can prove. The evidence is merely circumstantial at the best, and there is always the possibility that creation in progressive stages by God may have produced the forms now found fossil.

However, personally, I am becoming increasingly sceptical about the whole successive age theory, based on the idea of sinking and rising continents, causing the ocean to slowly sweep over the land, and produce the fossils, then recede so that another crop of evolved life could follow in that place, which in turn would be slowly overwhelmed by the ocean, and so on through the long ages assumed by geological speculation. There are too many facts which have been discovered contrary to the whole theory of successive ages for me to accept the theory any longer on the mere ipse dixit of the evolutionist. How explain the successive strata of the coal regions, for example, where the coal seams alternate with other

strata for great heights or rather depths superimposed on each other? Are we to say that the same geological age occurred over and over again in one place? If this theory of successive ages is true, how are we to explain the fact that strata alleged by evolutionists to have been deposited millions of years apart are found to rest upon the so-called earlier strata in perfect conformability, that is, with nothing in the way of erosion or deposition of other matter between them to indicate the passage of millions of years? To all appearances the two strata might have been deposited one after the other on the same day!

The really difficult puzzle for the evolutionist to solve, however, is found in those vast regions where the strata are apparently, from the evolutionists standpoint, found in an upsidedown order. In Montana and Alberta, Canada, is the famous Lewis Thrust Fault where Cambrian and Algonkian strata are found on top of Cretaceous strata, in a territory 15 miles wide and 600 miles long. In the Alps the so-called older strata are said to have moved over the younger strata for a distance of sixty miles. The evolutionist accounts for this by the thrust fault theory. The lower strata are supposed to have been pushed up and over the younger strata by some mysterious force. Of course the only real evidence of such a thing is the fact that the upper strata contain index fossils of the older age.

The thrust fault theory seems plausible until you begin to investigate the forces which might have caused such a result. I must confess my scepticism increases the more I try to picture the process alleged to have happened. About the only forces imaginable are some kind of explosive forces acting from within the earth to push the strata up in the air where gravitation could act on them and pull them down over the neighboring strata. Now normally all that would happen would be for the rocks just to be pushed up into the air. There might be breakage around the edges of the rocks pushed into the air, but it is difficult to see how they could be moved over surrounding strata by the force of gravitation. To imagine that such a thing could occur over a territory of 60 miles, is inconceivable. Even if the strata were to slide down hill, to imagine that they could slide for 60 miles, is reasoning that might do in Alice in Wonderland but not in scientific circles. Remember that you are not dealing with liquid lava, but with rocks that must have solidified long before the lower strata were laid down.

But if the thrust fault theory will not account for the facts and the strata were actually deposited in their present order, then the whole successive age theory collapses, and with it goes the last remnant of factual evidence for evolution.

Let us now investigate the biological evidence against evolution. If there is any permanent evolutionary force inherent in plants and animals, it should be discoverable today in the laboratory and should be amenable to experiment. The very essence of the evolutionary theory in its ordinary form is that evolutionary forces are eternal, and should therefore be just as potent today as in the alleged geological ages of the past. It is equally evident that there must be variation in nature if there is to be evolution, and that these variations must be capable of producing real evolution if given time enough. It also goes without saying that such variations must be heritable. As we have already said, most of the plausibility of the theory rests on the known fact that change goes on around us in nature, and it is therefore assumed that this change will produce evolution of one form of life into a higher form. To call all change evolution as does Vernon Kellogg, or to speak of downward change as evolution, is to try to make the real theory plausible by clothing it with the mantle of known facts in order to conceal the nakedness of the real theory. If all there were to evolution were

change, everyone would be an evolutionist, but the mere fact of change does not mean evolution. As has been said before, there must be progressive upward change, the acquisition of new qualities not previously possessed in order to have real evolution. Are there any changes of such a character known to biologists? Let us examine the different kinds of change in life forms.

First of all we have deformities and abnormalities, such as six-toed cats, Siamese twins and two-headed calves. Most of such things are not inherited unless they are mutations which will be taken up later in the discussion. If not inherited of course they cannot be the cause of evolution.

Then we have the minute variations which Darwin thought were the raw material for evolution, when he said that all forms of life tend to vary in an infinite number of ways, and that the force of natural selection perpetuated the favorable variations until they became the ancestors of new species. All such variations unless Mendelian or mutations are merely fluctuations around a given mean and are never inherited.

The next kind of variations to be considered are the variations produced by environment. Evolutionists are constantly assuming in popular books that a new environment can call forth changes in an organism which will be inherited. How often we see statements similar to this: "Fish which became stranded on mud flats by receding tides were forced to develop lungs, and so gradually they evolved into amphibians." Now any scientist who knows the facts of biology knows that such a statement is simply "hooney"! No amount of exposure on a mud flat would do anything else but kill a fish which did not already have the ability to breathe in the air, and no environment in the world could produce a heritable change in any animal or plant unless the gene for producing the change were already present in the chromosome of the germ cell. To speak of giraffes evolving their long necks by stretching them up to the leaves of trees during dry spells when the lower branches were denuded of foliage is on a par with the tales of Kipling such as "How the Elephant Got His Trunk"! in the *Jungle Book*. Not only would it have been impossible for a giraffe to acquire a longer neck simply because he needed it to reach the leaves, but if by some stretch of the imagination similar to the stretching of his neck, he once acquired a longer neck in such a manner, he could never have been able to transmit it to his baby giraffes, for acquired characteristics are simply not inherited, unless they are changes produced directly in the germ plasma by some narcotic or chemical, such as alcohol or nicotine. Incidentally, speaking of giraffes, lest there be any lingering belief that giraffes could get long necks that way, it is an interesting fact that all female giraffes have shorter necks than the males, and so must all have perished in the alleged drought, in which the longer necked males were able to reach the higher leaves and survive!

We come now to the consideration of changes which are inherited. Changes which occur according to Mendel's Law are unquestionably inherited. According to Mendel's Law when two individuals having differing characteristics are crossed, the second generation following will have a regrouping of the characteristics present in the grandparents, and some individuals will be born which will be different from any grandparent, though all the unit characters will have been present in the grandparents. This is most easily seen in plants which reproduce by self-fertilization, and which may be artificially crossed. If we cross tall green peas with short yellow peas, some of the descendants will be tall yellow and short green, thus producing individuals unlike either grandparent but having characteristics present in the grandparents. Wherever it is possible to produce

crosses between individuals either by ordinary sexual reproduction or by artificial crossing in the case of self-fertilizing plants, it is possible to produce new varieties of plants and animals, many of which differ markedly from the ancestors, but all of which have only the individual characteristics present in the ancestors.

Now at first thought, it seems plausible to consider such new varieties as the raw material for natural selection, and as the beginning of future species. There are however two insuperable reasons why Mendelian variations cannot be the cause of evolution. In the first place according to the evolutionist all evolution started with the primordial unicellular organisms which reproduced by cell division only. Mendel's Law does not apply to such cell division, and no Mendelian variation could ever arise as long as there was nothing but cell division reproduction. Thus if it depended on Mendelism, evolution could never even have gotten started! But still more important is the fact that in the second place, even where endless Mendelian changes do occur, there can never be real evolution, for you never get out of the circle of unit characters, called genes, with which you start! You can shuffle the genes and produce almost endless varieties, but you can never produce a single new characteristic according to Mendel's Law, and without new characteristics there can never be evolution. Thus Mendelian variations while heritable can never be the cause of evolution.

There is only one other kind of change known to biologists, mutations. Biologists today are fond of referring to mutations as the cause of evolution, and much loose language is used with reference to the way in which evolution has proceeded in "jumps," and the assumption is constantly made that these "jumps" may be in any direction and like the minute variations of Darwin, may become the raw material with which natural selection may work, thus after indefinite time producing new species, up the evolutionary ladder from primordial cell to man. From the evolutionary point of view this is very suggestive and as long as one deals in glittering generalities seems quite plausible. Two weeks ago I read a book dealing with the recent developments in cytology, by a reputable scientist, which in one of the concluding chapters calmly assumed that all the early stages of evolutionary history could be amply explained by mutations. The fact seemed entirely to have escaped his attention that in the preceding chapters where he was dealing with ascertained facts in cytology and genetics, he had really shown that any mutations such as he was assuming must have occurred in the past were absolutely impossible by any known mechanism of cytology!

Up to a few years ago not very much was known about mutations, and though at that time only regressive mutations had come to light, that is, mutations which represented the loss of characteristics previously possessed by the race, there was always the possibility that there might have been a true progressive mutation which would have taken the individual up the evolutionary scale. The mechanism of mutations, however, has recently been investigated by Morgan and others, so that today we can say with confidence that the only known mutations are of three particular kinds, and that none of these can really be examples of true evolution. Of course if one wants to ascend into the realm of pure speculation and say that there must have been other kinds of mutations in the past which are unknown to scientists of today, one can build all kinds of airy theories entirely unrelated to discovered facts, but such a proceeding can hardly be called scientific. As far as facts are concerned, there are only three kinds of mutations observed in nature, and all three kinds can now be analyzed and produced again

and again in nature. None of these three kinds can produce evolution as will be evident a little later.

In order to explain them it will be necessary to become a little technical, but even if you have not studied biology, the argument ought to be clear. In the process which precedes the cell division of the fertilized germ cell, the chromosomes of the germ cells in the nuclei of the cells, arrange themselves in parallel ranks, even apparently becoming twisted around each other, at times. Now on each chromosome are located all the genes or unit characters, which are responsible for the production of every single characteristic of the adult plant or animal. These genes are located in serial order up and down the chromosome, and are so linked to the chromosome that ordinarily they are inherited as a group.

The first kind of mutations is produced when, instead of separating and each one of each pair of chromosomes going into a different cell, as happens according to Mendel's Law, something happens to the cell which prevents the separation of the paired chromosomes, thus resulting in the adult individual having an extra set of chromosomes, and if it should happen again, producing what are called triploids, tetraploids, octoploids, etc. These extra chromosomes, however do not give the individual any new characteristics except increased size and similar features, and of course will not produce changes which could if given time, produce evolution.

The second kind of mutations is produced when what is called "crossing over" occurs. Sometimes the paired chromosomes become so wound around each other that when they separate, a break occurs at the point of contact, causing the upper part of the first chromosome to become attached to the lower part of the other, and the lower part of the first chromosome to become attached to the upper part of the second, thus causing each of the new chromosomes to have part of the other. Naturally all the genes which are linked to the exchanged portions are likewise exchanged, so that the new individual has a set of characteristics which seem to have been inherited contrary to Mendel's Law. This crossing over will occur in a certain percentage of cases and will result in this particular kind of mutation. Of course this can never result in evolution because all the genes were present in the ancestors and the change is merely a new grouping of the unit characters.

The third kind of mutation is likewise produced by the process of crossing over. Sometimes there is a gene on one part of a chromosome which is inhibited from showing its effects in the adult organism by another inhibiting gene in another part of the chromosome. As long as the two genes are on the same chromosome the first one cannot manifest its effects in the adult organism. When a crossing over occurs however which separates the two genes, the inhibited gene is now free to produce its effects, and a true mutation results, producing a characteristic not visible in the ancestors. This characteristic, however, is not really new because the gene for producing it was present all the time in the chromosomes and was merely prevented from showing itself by the inhibiting gene. This is proved by the fact that a crossing over may later occur which will carry the inhibited gene back to the chromosome which contained the inhibitor, and the new characteristic disappears, only to reappear at a later time in another crossing over.

Now of course such a mutation can never produce real evolution, no matter how common they may be in nature, for it will never add a single gene to the racial inheritance stream, and all the inhibited genes will appear over and over in the course of the history of the race. These three kinds of mutations, however,

include all that are known to biologists, and as I have shown can never be the cause of evolution.

There is one more fact to which we must call attention in this connection. About two weeks ago, when I was working on this subject the thought suddenly struck me that since all crossing overs occurred in sexual reproduction only, there was no known mechanism by which mutations could occur in primordial cells which reproduced only by cell division. Thus again the evolutionary process could never have gotten started by the observed mutations. To assume that there have been other kinds of mutations which have added new genes, by any change in the molecules etc., is pure speculation without foundation in facts observed in nature.

We have thus examined all changes known to nature, and see that none of them can have produced evolution. Change we see in nature in abundance. New combinations of characteristics can be produced wherever we can breed animals or plants together, but none of them can originate a new characteristic, and without the origination of new characteristics or the explanation of how the existing characteristics came into existence, there is no proof whatever that evolution has occurred, in biology itself.

There is one striking line of evidence remaining, which points directly against any evolution having occurred. Every species has a definite number of chromosomes in the germ cells. This number never changes except in cases where the number is increased by the doubling process above mentioned. This number is fixed for the species, and corresponds in no way to the evolutionary tree of the classificationists. If evolution has occurred we ought to find the number of chromosomes in man either at the top or the bottom of the scale, with the other animals ranging in between from monkeys to unicellular organisms. You might say that evolution has occurred by the loss of chromosomes or by the adding of chromosomes, but in any case the number ought to correspond to the evolutionary tree. As a matter of fact there is no rhyme or reason to these chromosome numbers. Man has 48, monkeys 54, dogs 22, horses 38, the cat 36, the mouse 40, the *diestrammena marmorata* of the insect group 58, the *aphis saliceti* 6 and the *drosophila melanogaster* 8. Some species have over a hundred and certain radiolaria have over 1,600. Now suppose it were possible to arrange the chromosome numbers of the different species according to the evolutionary tree. We all know that it would be used by evolutionists as proof that evolution has occurred. When we find that there is no such correspondence, have we not direct proof that evolution has not occurred?

The other day a student asked me what difference it made whether we believe in evolution or not. As I have said, I believe it would be possible to believe in a Christian evolution which might be harmonized with the Bible. The fact remains, however, that all atheists hide behind evolution whenever we try to convince them that there is a God. If we can show that there has been no evolution, then the fact of creation cannot be denied, and we will find the principal prop of unbelief taken away.

THE GIBRALTAR FACT OF CHRISTIANITY—THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST

MELVIN A. STUCKEY, TH.M.

The resurrection of Jesus Christ is the Gibraltar fact of the Christian faith. It is the corner-stone of the edifice of Christianity, and is built upon the impregnable Rock—Jesus Christ. Howling winds and beating tempests, and they have been many, have not prevailed against this Stone foundation and the building remains unshaken. In fact, those who have attempted persistently to undermine the Biblical facts and destroy the effective and eternal work of Christ, have themselves been shaken, shattered, and sifted. They have been left—little stones—on the shorelines of time to wear away under the ebb and flow of their own corrosive doctrines.

Any fair investigation of the Scriptures concerning the fact of the resurrection will reveal a wondrous and convincing line of witnesses with a multifarious and yet highly united testimony. It will be discovered that they are *honest, intelligent, sober, and judicious* in their reports and in their reasoning. They believe Christ actually rose from the dead. What they say therefore, and what Christ claimed, together with an added feature, will be the burden of the present effort of the writer.

I. *The Witness of the Old Testament.*

David, the sweet singer of Israel, in Psalm sixteen, gave voice to a significant resurrection prophecy:

“Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.”

“Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore.” (16:10, 11).

In the books of the Acts of the Apostles, Luke the physician records:

“Being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne;

“He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, neither his flesh did see corruption.” (2:30, 31).

It is very evident from the above New Testament quotations that David did not refer to himself, but to Christ.

II. *The Witness of the Four Evangelists.*

In “The Teachers’ Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew” by Dr. F. N. Peloubet, there appears an outline structure setting forth the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection.* It includes more evidence than that of the Four Evangelists, but that will only serve as useful and additional infor-

*OUR LORD’S APPEARANCES AFTER HIS RESURRECTION

Eleven Times, In Different Places, During Forty Days

Order	Time	To Whom	Where	Record
1	Sunday, April 9. the morning	Early in To Mary Magdalene	Near the sepulchre at Jerusalem	Mark 16:9 John 20:11-18
2	Sunday morning	To the women returning from the sepulchre	Near Jerusalem	Matt. 28:9, 10
3	Sunday	To Simon Peter alone	Near Jerusalem	Luke 24:34
4	Sunday afternoon	To two disciples going to Emmaus	Between Jerusalem and Emmaus, and at Emmaus	Luke 24:13-31

mation at this point for the reader. It is difficult to attempt to modify or improve Dr. Peloubet's array of the essential evidence. Take up your Bible and read every passage at your own convenience. Kindly remember you are studying the evidence. Draw your own conclusions.

III. *The Witness of the Saviour's Predictions.*

Did Jesus ever utter words looking forward to His own resurrection? The answer is at hand. He did. But what value can be attached to such indirect type of proof? Simply this, it proves that the resurrection was in keeping with the claims and honesty of Jesus.

A few samples will suffice. "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up," and "The Son of Man . . . must be raised the third day." The familiar reference to the prophet Jonah's entombment in the stomach of a great fish and Christ's interment in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea, is almost too familiar for repetition here, yet it is one of the Lord's sayings concerning His resurrection from the grave. Today, as in every day, Christians recognize these passages to be fulfilled prophecy.

IV. *The Witness of the Character of Christ.*

The Gospel story of Jesus reveals "the perfect God and the perfect Man." As God He met all the expectations of men, yea, so far transcended them that mankind still marvels at His supernatural power and supernatural life. As Man He stands singularly alone—transcendentally alone—and none of the sons of Adam care to debase themselves before their fellows by comparing themselves to Mary's Son. Truly everything in Jesus is different, is extraordinary, is supernatural. The record of His resurrection is supernatural; it is absolutely in line with His conduct. He is, if His words are false, the greatest of all deceivers and imposters. It is inconceivable that He should be Satan's arch representative in the matter of dishonesty. *A character so beautiful as His could never have been forged in the Devil's worship.*

V. *The Witness of the Empty Tomb.*

There are only two alternatives in the matter of the empty tomb. Either superhuman power or human hands removed Christ's body from the grave. If human hands did it, then they must have been those of friends or foes. If friends did the work, how did they get past the guards to remove the great stone by destroying the seal? If foes did it—one can hardly believe they would even consider it—they would have established the fact of the resurrection—a fact which they sought to prevent (Mt. 27:63-66). If foes did steal it, why did they leave the grave clothes near by? Again, why did not the Jews produce His dead body to disprove the resurrection claims of the preaching disciples at Pentecost? One answer prevails to the above questions: *God raised Jesus; the disciples knew it and proved it; the enemies sought to extirpate the fact by persecuting the Christians.*

5 Sunday evening	To the apostles, excepting Jerusalem Thomas	John 10:19-25
6 Sunday evening, April 16	To the apostles, Thomas Jerusalem being present	John 20:26-29 Mark 16:14-18
7 Last of April or first of May	To seven disciples fishing Sea of Galilee	John 21:1-13
8 Last of April or first of May	To the eleven disciples on Galilee a mountain	Matt. 28:16-20
9 Last of April or first of May	To above five hundred Galilee brethren	I Cor. 15:6
10 May	To James only Jerusalem, probably	I Cor. 15:7
11 Thursday, May 18	To all the apostles at His Mount of Olives, near ascension Bethany	Luke 24:50, 51 Acts 1:6-12

VI. *The Witness of the Transformed Disciples.*

The decease of Jesus upon the Roman tree spelled defeat—hopeless defeat for the disciples. They were as “sheep without a shepherd”—scattered, wounded, bleeding in heart. But the first day of the week found them in an altogether different state of mind. Their beloved Saviour broke asunder the bars of death and conquered the gates of Hell. They were delirious with excitement and joy; they could hardly believe what they saw; and Thomas, more doubtful than his friends, sought absolute proof and found it in the open wounds (Jn. 20:27). *Could anything but the fact of the resurrection change the ever-changing disciples into the changeless preachers of Pentecost? Could a legend do that in its working? Or a psychological hallucination?*

VII. *The Witness of the Apostolic Church.*

Luke, than whom there is not a more sober and judicious historian, records for the primitive church these words:

“He showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.”

In other words the very existence of the Apostolic Christian Church is dependent on the fact of the resurrection, and the preaching of the kingdom of God. Sunday, the day of worship, became the commemorative day of the Christians in remembrance of that great fact. *If Christ did not rise, how shall we explain to an enquiring world the sudden change of the day of worship? Be sure to read also Acts 1:21, 22; 2:24, 29-32; 4:33.*

VIII. *The Witness of the Apostle Paul.*

The Apostle Paul is in a unique sense a very special witness to the resurrection. I Thessalonians 2:15 and 4:14 speak very plainly of the death and resurrection of our Lord. The well known fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians is a medley of spiritual music favoring Christ's resurrection and ours, centering seemingly in the sublime symphonic theme: “Last of all he was seen of me also.” Truly the dirge of Calvary must always give way to the symphony of the resurrection on every Easter morning and on every other day of the Christian's life.

“Vain the stone, the watch, the seal,
Christ hath burst the gates of hell!
Death in vain forbids His rise;
Christ hath opened Paradise.”

IX. *The Witness of the Neglected Scriptures.*

It is customary to seek evidences and proofs for the resurrection of Jesus in the writings of the Four Evangelists and St. Paul. In so doing the church has perhaps neglected other important references to the passion and victory of our Saviour over the grave. For instance, take these passages from the lips of an apostle in I Peter 1:3-21 and 3:18-21. Add to these the familiar references in the Acts and Simon Peter's testimony is very conclusive: Acts 1:22, 2:24-33; 3:13-15; 4:10; 5:31, 32; 10:40-42.

Hebrews 13:20 tells us of the God of peace “who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus,” while the Revelator John speaks of Christ as “the first born of the dead.” The *words* and *lives* of these men are forceful witnesses to the established and unassailable fact of the resurrection.

X. *The Witness of the Alternative Theories.*

Those who have opposed the fact of the resurrection have erected theories of

their own to explain the events recorded in the Gospels, and in the other New Testament books. Brief mention shall be made of each.

1. *The Falsehood Theory.*

This theory suggests that the *veracity* of the eye-witnesses was questionable, and implies strongly that they did not tell the entire truth, but only part of it. Do you think, gentle reader, that the sufferings, conduct, and motives of the Eleven could be so openly questioned without proof that they were intentional deceivers?

2. *The Legend Theory?*

This theory questions the *knowledge* of the witnesses and states that they were followers of *legendary* truths by virtue of their ignorance. However, how could a legend rise so quickly? These men were very competent to judge well between issues on other occasions, so why not here? This is a weak theory.

3. *The Vision Theory.*

Seemingly this theory would deny powers of *investigation* to the eye-witnesses. They saw *visions*, it is alleged. But do not the accounts certify that they did investigate the risen Lord's wounds? Was a Spirit buried? Did only a Spirit rise? Luke, a medical doctor, records: "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as *ye* see me have." (Luke 24:39). The "ye" is plural. Do you think a historian-physician was deceived?

4. *The Swoon Theory.*

What this view holds to be the truth is this: the witnesses lacked *reasoning* powers. He only swooned, they say. Therefore Christ never really did die: the disciples only thought so. His appearances are to be accounted for on that basis. Did not Pilate marvel at His early death? Was not His side pierced? Did not blood flow? Why were His legs not broken? Why was He buried by His friends? Was Nicodemus competent to judge a case of swooning? Think, readers, think!

The whole truth and nothing but the truth is this: these major objections have failed to explain the Biblical records of Christ's resurrection. Their signal failure, largely because of inherent weaknesses, is the strongest possible proof for the Christian view.

To Dr. Charles Hodge, the famous Princeton theologian, there came a student saying, "I am greatly troubled with doubts as to the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel. Will you go over with me the arguments for the Being of God, and Immortality, and the Atonement, and the Personality of the Spirit?" The great teacher answered: "It isn't argument that you want, my young friend, but a closer touch with Christ. Get into the fellowship of service; thrust your sickle into the harvest; learn the joy of growing weary in duty; and your doubts will pass." Our doubts pass when we live the resurrected life.

Several years ago the writer saw this inscription on the tombstone of a famous man in a Philadelphia cemetery:

The Body of
B. FRANKLIN, PRINTER,
(Like the Cover of an Old Book,
its Contents Torn Out
and Stript of its Lettering and Gilding)
Lies Here, Food for Worms;
But the Work Shall Not Be Lost:
For It Will (As he Believes) Appear Once More

in A New and More Elegant Edition;
 Revised and Corrected
 By its Author.

And

“So shall it be at last, in that bright morning,
 When the soul waketh, and life’s shadows flee;”

that we shall all be “revised and corrected” by the “Author” of our souls and bodies. Unlike Franklin’s, *Christ’s body does not lie in a Judean tomb, nor does it mingle with the stars of the morning. He is beyond sunrise and sunset with the Father. And someday—through His glorious resurrection—we shall have the priceless privilege of thinking His thoughts and singing His praises “in a new and more elegant edition.”*

A TOUR AMONG THE COLLEGES

JACK DEVRIES, A.B.

Last May, through the beneficence of a faithful League friend, a deputation tour was arranged for the Westminster Seminary Branch. Six students traveling a distance of 2500 miles covered 6 eastern states and visited 43 colleges. The aim of this trip was two-fold: First, to discover, and to aid in the solution of, problems existing among established chapters; Second, to introduce the League and its function on previously neglected campuses and to engage the interests of evangelical students in the formation of chapters. It would be beyond the compass of this article to record a detailed report of conditions and accomplishments at each individual college frequented. Readers interested in this detail will find a complete list of these colleges appended to this article. If further information is desired, kindly correspond with the Seminary Branch Secretary Mr. Egbert Andrews, 1528 Pine Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

It will be of great and immediate value, however, to register observations made on the tour. Though the deputation group in no way purported to be a Findings Committee, yet in its work certain matters were recurrently brought to its attention. A trip of this nature brings one face to face with the situations and problems of a college campus. In presenting and advocating the League, questions such as these naturally kept repeating themselves: *Are the chapters fulfilling their function?* Does the League have a definite and appealing work to offer to new campuses? Is the League, as the Church of God among college students, conscious of its task, that of the defense and propagation of Christian truth in the intellectual world? To resolve these into a single interrogation: *Are we answering the high purpose of our organization as comprehended in Article II of the Constitution, that of raising the best possible witness to the Gospel of the Cross?* In light of our tenth anniversary which we remember this year, to consider these questions is most opportune. Though in answering them we may glory in the Providence of God for His grace in prospering our work, we ought never to blind our eyes to past failings and new obligations. We may praise God for His goodness yet we should repent of our sins and pray for the Spirit’s guidance in solving the problems now confronting us.

The foregoing questions have in common a basic assumption—the *League has a work to do*. That work is the witness to and the defense of the Christian faith. It has been said that the very existence of a League chapter on a college campus is witnessing. And, indeed, so severe may be the hostility to the faith at some institutions that the very presence of a band of Christian men and women is a testimony and a challenge to the student body. Under such conditions, what encouragement to meet weekly or bi-weekly in fellowship and prayer with other student Christians who are together having their faith undermined in classroom and in college hall! But what great temptation, too, to assume a policy of non-resistance and to make the retreat of the mystic! How easy it is to despair of

influencing other students and teachers and to hide our light under a bushel! If we wish to do any Christian work, we take the easy road and affiliate ourselves with churches in the city to engage in Sunday School, Christian Endeavor and Mission Work. Psychologically, all this is easy to explain; morally, it is hard to justify. Our field of labor, as League members, is not the church; it is the student world. To us has been committed the treasure of eternal life in Jesus Christ—it is our obligation to preach the way of life to fellow students. We are the leaven which is to leaven the whole lump. We are to be a salting salt. Does it not seem reasonable that the Spirit of God should use Christian students to evangelize students? If we neglect the task, *who then shall preach to them?*

We cannot rest content by merely existing. A positive function is divinely imposed on us. The responsibility of waging offensive warfare against unbelief is ours by virtue of the fact that we are Christ's. Can we realize its tremendousness when on the average college campus today, yes even in the entire college town, there is raised not another single voice to the truth? Not only may faculty and students be antagonistic to the faith made ours but college chaplains, student pastors and church ministers preach a natural religion which appears to be a semblance of Christianity but is throughout a vicious denial of it. Hegel and Kant of the classroom come to us in Schleiermacher and Ritschl of the pulpit. We need not deceive ourselves—it is a fact, that in many colleges the League stands alone in raising the banner of the cross. We can now possibly appreciate our task more keenly if we are reminded that attending classes with us there are possibly hundreds who have come from sound Christian homes and churches but to whom the concerted attack upon their faith has come so violently as to make them totter. The many anti-Christian influences bearing upon them have combined to make them doubtful, skeptical, unbelieving. May we neglect our duty here? *If we neglect, yes, who then shall preach to them?*

It must come to us very clearly that we have a work to perform and that our work is on the college campus. We may add that the League has a distinctive work. In saying this, we mean here specifically that there is no other student organization in existence built upon the principles of the League of Evangelical Students. If we think the Young Men's or Young Women's Christian Association, Student Volunteers, Christian Student Movement or Inter-Seminary Movement serve the same ends as the League, we have then failed to understand the distinctiveness of the League. Not only are none of these consistently Biblical but none of them purposes to combat the contra-Biblical tendencies in the modern educational world. The League is distinctive in its conviction that only Biblical Christianity is true and that as such it must conquer the world.

If we have failed in our distinctive function, it may be because we have not been conscious of our task. The root of the trouble, however, possibly strikes deeper. Permit me to present it by way of citing a salient danger. League chapters are exposed to it. There is, let us say, a group of Leaguers at John Barclay College. It is a thoroughly agnostic institution. The philosophy department is given to Pragmatism; science to Evolution; literature and art to Humanism and Realism. The man who teaches courses in English Old Testament and New Testament repudiates the supernatural and applies the Higher—critical method. On every side there is such an intense and bitter flouting of the Christian faith that to raise a word for Christ they confess seems futile. Their witness engenders no response or sympathy; they invite only persecution from students and college authorities. To forego all contumely, taunt and embarrassment, they decline all efforts to testimony. Instead they hold secret meetings in a student's room to enjoy an hour's Christian fellowship and prayer. They offend no one since they bear no marks of an organization and are without college sanction. Fellow students and faculty jeer at them but hardly care to disown them; they regard these Christians, mystics, and, therefore, harmless. For mysticism makes no appeal to a student.

In representing Christianity as something subjective merely, the chapter fell into a serious error. The representation would be quite all right, if it were true. But it is not true. Although born again by the Spirit, the Christian does stand in mystical union with Christ and can experience blessed communion with His God, he at the same time possesses a true knowledge contained in the inspired word of God. And now that knowledge is not true because we, through grace, are in possession of it. It is true in spite of us. It is *objective truth*. We say

that in essence when we state that God will one day either condemn or save a man. God is Truth—the sons of God have the truth; those not sons, have error.

If what we possess is a system of knowledge that is true, certainly the Christian student is duty bound to preach it as *the only reasonable* world and life view. Every other thought system should be shown to be unreasonable. If we, on the other hand, make the exit of the recluse we are in danger of making our faith one of emotion merely, and not one of the intellect. We are distorting the Christian faith not only for ourselves but are misrepresenting it to others. Will the Spirit of truth use us as His ministers through the avenue of misrepresentation? If there is any field of evangelization where Christianity should be presented as a religion that satisfies the demands of the mind it is on the college campus; to students we ought to stress the primacy of the intellect.

The hypothetical Barclay College Chapter is, sad to say, not so hypothetical after all. It is even quite typical. The illustration is real. A large number of chapters have become victims of this fault. The reason for this failure might be that we have no desire to witness—yet what Christian will not witness for his Lord? The reason might be that we are not particular in what way we preach **our faith**—yet what Christian does not wish to represent the Christian faith according to Biblical principles? The reason might be that we feel ourselves insufficient to combat the intellectual attack because we have a very inadequate knowledge of Biblical doctrine. *That, I fear, is the reason.* If we do not understand the system of knowledge contained in the Word, how can we present Christianity as a reasonable faith? It is only when we comprehensively understand the Scripture that the conviction grows within us that Christianity alone satisfies the mind. Only then, when we preach will we secure respect of our listeners and can the Spirit operate in the hearts of men.

What then ought we to do? We should pray; we should also work. The one never to the exclusion of the other. League chapters should study—study the Word. And in studying we should make great use of that which the Holy Spirit through the illumination of consecrated men and councils has committed to the Church. We have a rich heritage of Christian faith come to expression in works extant and at our disposal. What greater trust than Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Bavinck, Kuyper, Orr, Warfield, the Hodges, the Greenes, Vos and Machen, Keyser, Berkhof of today! What finer opportunities than our Regional Conferences and National Conventions to receive instruction! The February Convention will exceed all previous ones in instructive value. Do not neglect this profitable occasion. And let us always study the Word with these aids!

If thus we prepare ourselves for the mortal combat, we shall the better witness. We shall not then with undue deliberateness tell the naturalist that a denial of the Virgin Birth is a forfeiture of Christian truth. We shall not hesitate to see that Buchmanism is irreconcilable with our faith! We can readily say that theistic evolution is unbiblical. We shall present Christianity unadulterated, free from error, true to Scripture. And our striving shall not be losing!

* * * * *

The movement afoot on the Atlantic Seaboard to amalgamate certain student organizations forebodes a grim disastrous enemy. The future shall be darker still unless we face the challenge. May we never surrender our distinctiveness, nor compromise, nor render to Caesar what we must render to God. Let us therefore work before the night cometh when no man can work!

“Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation it was needful for me to write unto you that ye should *earnestly contend* for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.” Jude 3.

COLLEGE LIST

<i>Princeton University</i> , Princeton, New Jersey	Chapter
<i>Bloomfield College and Theological Seminary</i> , Bloomfield, N. J.	Chapter
<i>Lafayette College</i> , Easton, Pa.	Chapter
<i>Lehigh University</i> , Bethlehem, Pa.	Chapter
<i>Moravian College and Theological Seminary</i> , Bethlehem, Pa.	
<i>Moravian Women's College</i> , Bethlehem, Pa.	

- Lebanon Valley College*, Annville, Pa.
Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
- **Shippensburg State Teachers' College*, Shippensburg, Pa.
Albright College and Evangelical School of Theology, Reading, Pa.
Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa. Chapter
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown, Pa.
University of Western Maryland, Westminster, Md.
Blue Ridge College, New Windsor, Md.
- **Juniata College*, Huntingdon, Pa.
Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa.
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa. Chapter
- **Westminster College*, New Wilmington, Pa.
Clarion State Teachers' College, Clarion, Pa.
Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.
Slippery Rock State Teachers' College, Slippery Rock, Pa.
University of West Virginia, Morgantown, W. Va.
Fairmont State Teachers' College, Fairmont, W. Va.
Anderson Broadus College, Philippi, W. Va.
Davis-Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va.
Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.
Farmville State Teachers' College, Farmville, Va.
- †*Hampden-Sydney College*, Hampden-Sydney, Va.
University of Richmond, Richmond, Va.
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.
University of Maryland, College Park, Md.
Johns Hopkins Medical School and Nurses College, Baltimore, Md. . . . Chapter
University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
Washington College, Chestertown, Md.

* Favorable prospects for a chapter

† Chapter since formed.

CHAPTERS!

A Practical Suggestion for a Program of Study

There is available for chapters who have hitherto lacked a definite program of study a book well adapted for use among chapters of the League. The title of the book is *Study Your Bible*—the same being a self study course for Bible Believing Christians. It is a study of the book of Genesis—one of the foundation books of the Bible, and fraught with many problems. The author—Mr. Edward J. Young—deals with these problems in a scholarly yet interesting and lucid way. This little book provides a happy combination of a scholarly discussion of the problems of Genesis and a presentation of the deep spiritual truths or doctrines imbedded in this book. The book can be secured from League Headquarters at the reduced price of fifty cents the copy (paper cover) or sixty cents the copy (cloth cover).

NEWS OF THE LEAGUE

The League In China Has Its First National Conference. From Chancellor Arie Kok comes the following communication concerning this League affiliated with the American movement:

"The first national Conference for Evangelical Students in China was held in the month of September last. I was invited to go but, much to my regret, was prevented. Dr. Dodd wrote me that they had a good Conference. Many of the Students of the North China Theological Seminary came back to Tenghsien, the place of meeting, earlier than usual in order to attend the Conference. Among the 50 odd visiting delegates were about 16 students. Eleven branches of the League of Evangelical Students were represented by 18 voting delegates. Apart from the students, a number of preachers of several other mission stations attended. If there had been more funds at hand to assist the delegates somewhat in travelling expenses, the Conference would have been much bigger. However, in these days, we must content ourselves with small things and thank God even for the little He permits us to do. As for information regarding Dr. Eddy, please don't trouble. I have collected plenty and overwhelming evidence of his present views and intentions, and, now he is visiting China again. At present, I have been in a position to supply several others with reliable data. He is doing much spiritual harm to the students. May God forgive him."

* * * * *

Six New Chapters Apply for Membership. Since the 1934 Annual Convention of the League the following Chapters have applied for membership in the League:

	Members
Albany College	9
Hampden-Sydney College	21
Hahnemann Medical College	3
Johns Hopkins Training School	5
Kansas State Teachers College	10
Vassar College	7

These applications will be voted on at the Tenth Annual Convention of the League of Evangelical Students.

* * * * *

The Field Secretary Takes An Extensive Trip. During the month of November the Field Secretary visited thirty-four colleges and seminaries in the interests of the League. A distance of twenty-five hundred miles was covered—at the cost of only forty-five dollars. The territory worked was the southern part of Michigan and the majority of the colleges in Ohio. The reason for selecting this territory was to connect the two strong centers of the League—the East and the mid-West. It is a reasonable hope that within a year the first Regional Conference for the State of Ohio will be sponsored at Ashland College. Numerous speaking engagements in chapel services and in churches were arranged for the Secretary. Pray that the Spirit of God might work mightily in the hearts of the students reached that they might see in the eternal Christ their Savior and King and become courageous witnesses to His truth on their respective campuses.

* * * * *

Regional Conference In Texas. From Philip E. Wichern, chairman of the Dallas Seminary Branch comes the following communication:

"I should like to report a Regional Conference which we held here at the Evangelical Theological College, November 16-18, with twelve registrations, and strong support from the representative student body of the College which comes from all over the U. S. Texas A. and M. College; Baylor University, Waco, Texas; Austin College, Sherman, Texas (three delegates) and Oklahoma University, Norman, Okla., (five delegates) were represented. We had a splendid time together with mutual profit and blessing by the good hand of our God. We believe that the work has been given an added impetus, and that the foundation for a

growing work in the Southwest has been started. The outside interest and enthusiasm was fine. We voted to spend some time each Sunday from 5 to 6 p. m. in prayer for one another and the League in our respective groups."

* * * * *

Regional Conference at the University of Minnesota. In November there was a Regional Conference held for the Western and mid-Western States. Groups from Wheaton and Moody were able to get over. This is about the third Regional Conference for Minnesota. Increasingly Regional Conferences are proving an important part of the testimony of the League.

* * * * *

Dr. Machen Speaks for the League at Lafayette College. In December Dr. J. Gresham Machen spoke under the auspices of the League at two services in Easton. The one service was in a Baptist Church in Easton. The other was at an open meeting in the Y. M. C. A. building on the college campus. Seventy invitations were sent to students and professors of the college. About fifty were present at this occasion—a goodly number of whom were students.

* * * * *

Eastern Baptist Seminary. Growing interest. Had Dr. Machen, C. K. Cummings and R. B. Kuiper to speak to the League group.

* * * * *

Calvin Seminary Branch. The Branch at Calvin Seminary plans to be actively engaged in deputation work among colleges in northern Michigan. The Field Secretary of the League worked the colleges in southern Michigan. With this assistance the Calvin Seminary Branch hopes to reach every college in Michigan in an effort to extend the testimony of the League. The Branch has also been visiting numerous Christian Reformed congregations and speaking to them about the work of the League. Speaking engagements were arranged for the Field Secretary at Calvin College, Calvin Seminary, and one of the Christian Reformed Churches. Almost every Consistory in and around Grand Rapids has been approached by some member of the Calvin Seminary Branch in an effort to present to them the work of the League of Evangelical Students and to elicit their support.

* * * * *

Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science. "The Rev. Charles Anderson of the Missinoming Baptist Church is meeting with the fellows every week for a half hour of Bible Study and prayer. We are meeting Tuesdays from 1:15 to 1:45. The outlook is very encouraging. The meetings have been a real blessing so far and we expect to reach many of the unsaved here at the school."

* * * * *

Westminster Seminary Branch. The Secretary of the Branch reports: "Last May six members of the Westminster Branch made a tour of forty-three colleges in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware in the interests of the League. Recently visits have been made to chapters in Philadelphia and the immediate vicinity: University of Pennsylvania, Haverford College and Philadelphia College of Pharmacy and Science. Members of the Faculty have addressed the Eastern Baptist Seminary Chapter. Further visits for starting new chapters and strengthening existing ones are planned to Ursinus College, Drexel Institute, and the chapter at Temple University. Please pray for God's blessing on the work done and on the witness made. In addition to the above activities of the Branch, the work of the League is constantly remembered before God in prayer both at the weekly prayer meetings of the Student Body and at other times. The Field Secretary addressed the Branch in October."

* * * * *

The Need for "The Evangelical Student"—A Letter from Albania.—. " . . . A young Albanian college student from Greece has been home for the summer vacation. At his invitation, we have spent hours alone on a hill top overlooking the broad Kortcha plain. Of course I have known of the unbelief so prevalent in schools today; haven't we all passed through it? But I had always placed

confidence in the mission-supported schools. This young man finished our American Mission school in Kortcha, then was recommended to Anatolia College in Salonica, Greece. His early Bible and Christian teaching here has there been overthrown; psychology and ethics. All those afternoons we talked; but though unwillingly, he has now gone the way of his professors' reasoning. He cannot believe in a God, the continuity of personal life, the authority of the Bible, and questions even the historicity of Christ, and the value of any religion. He says he is still conservative compared to other students.

Thank God his system hasn't "set" yet, and he is still open to the truth. I'll never forget his expression of intense dissatisfaction. The plain had been swallowed up in the evening darkness, and still he was inquiring "how can these things be?" We were alone up there, and God seemed very near. Then it was that he told of his real despair of such a hopeless system, and his wish that he could really believe again. So I'm writing this letter to you. Will you send your magazine to this address for a year? I want the benefit of it, then will send it on to the college library. (English is their official language.) Also do you have any concise publications—tracts or pamphlets, on the reasonableness and integrity of the great fundamentals of the Gospel? Please send them along, and I will repay you unto the half of my kingdom!

May God bless your greatly needed work,"

RADIO BROADCASTS FOR STUDENTS

Messages by Dr. J. Gresham Machen on "The Christian Faith in the Modern World" will be broadcast every Sunday afternoon from 4:00 to 4:30 over WIP, Philadelphia. These messages will be doctrinal messages from one who is recognized as the leader of Orthodox Christianity in America today. Tune in!

A LIST OF EVANGELICAL TEXTBOOKS*

WITH SUGGESTIONS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY READING

LEANDER S. KEYSER

I—For Christian Colleges

Bible History

A MANUEL OF BIBLE HISTORY (new edition, 1920). By William G. Blaikie, D.D., LL.D. Thomas Nelson and Sons, New York, London and Edinburgh.

A BRIEF BIBLE HISTORY (1922). By J. O. Boyd, Ph.D., D.D., and J. G. Machen, D.D. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

Aids to Bible Study

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE BIBLE. By J. Sheatsley, D.D. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio.

SYNTHETIC BIBLE STUDIES. By James M. Gray, D.D. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, 843-845 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

BIBLE STUDIES IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT RESEARCH (second edition, 1930). By Augustus William Ahl, A.M., Ph.D. The Christian Alliance Publishing Company, New York. An introductory manual for colleges and seminaries.

THE OPEN BIBLE (1918). By O. M. Norlie, Ph.D. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.

*Reprinted, by the gracious permission of the author with his authorized additions and alterations, for especial use in the EVANGELICAL STUDENT.

This list is here published as the response to a frequent request made of the General Secretary for good evangelical literature for students. It is intended to be only a suggested reference list of standard books for those desiring normative and representative conservative literature.

Christian Evidence

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES (1923). By H. E. Dana, D.D. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, N. Y.

THE DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE. By W. E. Vine, M.A. Pickering & Inglis, 14 Paternoster Row, London, England.

THE BIBLE UNDER FIRE (1927). By John L. Campbell, D.D. Harper and Brothers, New York and London.

Biblical Doctrine

THE GREAT DOCTRINES OF THE BIBLE (1912). By William Evans, Ph.D., D.D. The Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, Ill.

Life of Christ

THE STORY OF JESUS (1924). By M. Hadwin Fischer, Ph.D. The United Utharan Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE MODERN STUDENT'S LIFE OF CHRIST: A TEXTBOOK. By Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago.

Bible Study

WHERE DID WE GET OUR BIBLE? (1928). By George L. Robinson, Ph.D., D.D. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, N. Y. \$2.00.

Person of Christ

THE SUPERNATURAL JESUS (1924). By George W. McDaniel, D.D., LL.D. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, N. Y.

Supplementary Reading

ALL ABOUT THE BIBLE. By Sidney Collett. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, and London. Fourteenth edition.

PRIMERS OF THE FAITH. By James M. Gray, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, and Chicago. An acute and constructive book.

THE STUDENT'S HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND (revised edition, 1924). By William W. Smith, A.M., M. D. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, New York.

THE AUTHENTICITY AND AUTHORITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (1926). By William C. Proctor, F.Ph. Charles J. Thynne & Jarvis, Ltd., Whitefriars Street, London.

AN OUTLINE OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE. By James H. Brookes, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago.

VOICES FROM ROCKS AND DUST HEAPS OF BIBLE LANDS (1928). By J. A. Huffman, D.D. The Standard Press, Marion, Indiana. A useful volume on the Bible and Archeology.

THE CHRIST AND THE CREED (1927). By Bishop Warren A. Candler, D.D., LL.D. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. Cogently upholds the Biblical doctrine.

THE CHRIST OF THE AGES, (1928). By Harold Paul Sloan, D.D. Doubleday, Doran and Company, Garden City, N. Y. A masterly presentation.

CHRIST IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES (sixth edition, 1922). By A. M. Hodgkin. Pickering & Ingles, 13-14 Paternoster Row, London, E. C. 4. A convincing book; treats of the prophecies of the Old Testament and sets forth clearly the Christ of the New Testament.

ON TO PHILADELPHIA!

For the Tenth Annual

Convention of

The League of Evangelical Students

FEBRUARY 21ST-24TH

The League of Evangelical Students

HEADQUARTERS

Philadelphia — Pennsylvania

Address—Reformed Episcopal Seminary, 25 S. 43rd St.

The League of Evangelical Students of China—Affiliated.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

President, HENRY STOB, Calvin Theological Seminary
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Vice-President, JOSEPH PLEVA, University of Minnesota
Minneapolis Minnesota

Secretary—EGBERT W. ANDREWS, Westminster Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

VIRGINIA LATTA, Wilson College
Chambersburg, Pennsylvania

ARTHUR W. KONRAD, Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

R. B. KUIPER, M.A., B.D., *President*,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

LEWIS SPERRY CHAFER, D.D., *Vice-
President*,
Dallas, Texas.

ALBERTUS PIETERS, D.D., *Secretary*,
Holland, Michigan.

I. H. LINTON, B.A., LL.B., *Treasurer*,
Kellogg Bldg., Washington, D. C.

CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D.,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.

MILO F. JAMISON, M.A., B.Th.,
Los Angeles, California.

CALVIN K. CUMMINGS, A.B.,
Philadelphia, Pa.

MISS MARJORIE ERDMAN,
Wooster, Ohio.

LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.,
Springfield, Ohio.

J. GRESHAM MACHEN, D.D., Litt.D.,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

HERBERT MACKENZIE, D.D.
Cleveland, Ohio.

WILLIAM CHILDS ROBINSON, M.A.,
Th.D., D.D.,
Decatur, Georgia.

ROBERT K. RUDOLPH, B.A., B.D.,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

HAROLD PAUL SLOAN, D.D.,
Haddonfield, New Jersey.

H. FRAMER SMITH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Chicago, Illinois.

The League of Evangelical Students is an inter-denominational and international student movement for the defense and propagation of the Gospel in the modern student-world. The League welcomes correspondence with individuals or groups contemplating affiliation.

The Evangelical Student is published in October, January, and April of each academic year. Every member of the League is entitled to a copy of each issue. The subscription price to non-members and to institutions, in all countries in the Universal Postal Union, is \$1.00 a year.

Printed in the United States of America.

CHAPTER DIRECTORY of the LEAGUE of EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

- ALBANY COLLEGE,
Albany, Oregon.
- ASHLAND COLLEGE,
Ashland, Ohio.
- BEAVER COLLEGE,
Jenkintown, Pennsylvania.
- BIBLE INSTITUTE AND ACADEMY
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- BLOOMFIELD COLLEGE AND THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Bloomfield, New Jersey.
- BOSTON UNIVERSITY,
Boston, Massachusetts.
- UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,
Vancouver, British Columbia.
- JOHN BROWN SCHOOLS,
Siloam Springs, Arkansas.
- BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY,
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania.
- CALVIN COLLEGE,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- CALVIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Grand Rapids, Michigan.
- CLEVELAND BIBLE INSTITUTE,
Cleveland, Ohio.
- COLUMBIA BIBLE COLLEGE,
Columbia, South Carolina.
- CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, New York.
- EASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMI-
NARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE,
Wollaston, Massachusetts.
- EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
Dallas, Texas.
- GENEVA COLLEGE,
Beaver Falls, Pennsylvania.
- GORDON COLLEGE OF THEOLOGY AND
MISSIONS,
Boston, Massachusetts.
- HAHNEMANN MEDICAL COLLEGE,
Philadelphia, Pa.
- HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE,
Hampden-Sydney, Va.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE,
Haverford, Pennsylvania.
- JOHNS HOPKINS MEDICAL TRAINING
SCHOOL,
Baltimore, Maryland.
- KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Pittsburgh, Kansas.
- KINGSTON BIBLE COLLEGE,
Kingston, Nova Scotia.
- WILSON COLLEGE,
Chambersburg, Pennsylvania.
- LAFAYETTE COLLEGE,
Easton, Pennsylvania.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY,
Bethlehem, Pa.
- UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE,
Louisville, Kentucky.
- UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- MOODY BIBLE INSTITUTE,
Chicago, Illinois.
- MUSKINGUM COLLEGE,
New Concord, Ohio.
- NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTE,
New York, New York.
- NEW ENGLAND SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY,
Boston, Massachusetts.
- NORTHWESTERN BIBLE SCHOOL,
Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA,
Norman, Oklahoma.
- UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
AND SCIENCE,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, New Jersey.
- QUEENS-CHICORA COLLEGE,
Charlotte, North Carolina.
- REFORMED EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- SHIPPENSBURG, STATE TEACHERS
COLLEGE,
Shippensburg, Pennsylvania.
- SIoux FALLS COLLEGE,
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.
- TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- UNION COLLEGE,
Schenectady, New York.
- UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
Seattle, Washington.
- VASSAR COLLEGE,
Poughkeepsie, New York.
- WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Holland, Michigan.
- WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- WHEATON COLLEGE,
Wheaton, Illinois.